DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 455 587 EA 031 144

AUTHOR	Apthorp, Helen
TITLE	Critical Collegiality & Self-Renewing Schools. Division K Symposium.
PUB DATE	2001-04-14
NOTE	73p.; Symposium, presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Seattle, WA, April 10-14, 2001).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adoption (Ideas): *Collegiality; *Cooperation; *Cooperative Programs; *Critical Thinking; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Group Activities; Management Development; Professional Development; Self Evaluation (Groups)

ABSTRACT

This document is four papers in one that focuses on the practice of critical collegiality through collaborative processes and how the resulting self-study may lead to positive school reform. "The Data in a Day Self-Study Process" (Kim Taylor) describes the Data in a Day process that brings teachers, parents, community members, administrators, and students together in a day of observations, note taking, analysis, and discussion to promote self-study. "Opportunities for Critical Collegiality through Collaborative Action Research Teams" (Patricia A. Lauer) characterizes the practice of professional development through research project collaboration and presents four case studies. "School Portfolios, Critical Collegiality, and Comprehensive School Reform" (Edmund T. Hamann, Brett Lane, and Susan Hackett Johnson) examines the state of Maine's use of portfolios as an extra mechanism to document school change processes for later reflection. "A Study of Critical Collegiality in One of The Learning Network Schools" (Helen Apthorp, Vickie Weseman, Peggy Moses, and Marilyn Herzog) examines how The Learning Network might have allowed a school to create some of the key features of critical collegiality and help teachers deepen their subject matter and pedagogical knowledge in the area of language arts. Each paper contains references. (RT)

ED 455 587

Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning

Critical Collegiality & Self-renewing Schools

Division K – Symposium

12:25 pm – 1:55 pm – Convention Center, Room 305, 3rd floor

CHAIR: Helen Apthorp, McREL

PARTICIPANTS: Kim Taylor, WestEd
Patricia A. Lauer, McREL
Edmund Hamann, Brett Lane &
Susan Hackett Johnson, LAB & Maine Dept. of Ed.
Helen Apthorp & Peggy Moses, McREL &
Prairie Park Elementary School

DISCUSSANT: Zoe Barley, McREL

Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Seattle, Washington. April 14, 2001.

McREL

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
H. Apthorp
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA031144

Table of Contents

The Data in a day Self-Study Process
Kim Taylor, WestEd

Opportunities for Critical Collegiality Through Collaborative Action Research Teams
Patricia A. Lauer, McREL

School Portfolios, Critical Collegiality, and Comprehensive School Reform
Edmund T. Hamann, The Education Alliance at Brown University
Brett Lane, The Education Alliance at Brown University
Susan Hackett Johnson, The Maine Department of Education

A Study of Critical Collegiality in one of the The Learning Network® Schools
Helen Apthorp, McREL
Vicki Weseman, Prairie Park Elementary
Peggy Moses, Prairie Park Elementary
Marilyn Herzog, The Learning Network®

The Data in a Day Self-Study Process

Kim Taylor, WestED

The professional development process described in this paper and enacted at Valley View K-8 School is Data in a Day (DIAD). This process was created by the Restructuring Collaborative and further developed by the School Change Collaborative (SCC), a national partnership organized by regional educational laboratories. The mission of the SCC is to bring together researchers and practitioners to improve the results of school improvement efforts. The SCC has been convening groups of educators since 1996 to find common ground related to school change efforts and to develop processes to bring student voice into these efforts. DIAD is one such process. Since 1998, the DIAD process has been used with elementary, middle, and high schools in rural, suburban, and urban areas in multiple geographical areas. AEL has used this process extensively as part of Quest, a network for continuously improving schools. NWREL has used DIAD as part of their Onward to Excellence II program for comprehensive school reform.

DIAD involves teachers, parents and community members, students, and administrators in a day of observations, note taking, analysis, and discussion. The process begins with generating themes for the observation. During this time, an outside researcher asks the staff, students, and other stakeholders to talk about efforts underway at their school and what questions they have about these efforts. Notes from this meeting are then formed into three to four key areas or themes. Under these areas, indicators are identified – specific things to look for during observations that could answer their questions. These observations are a snapshot in time but can be used to begin conversations among staff, students, and other stakeholders and lead to further study.

The DIAD process was created around the belief in the importance of self-study. The SCC believes that, "data must make sense and be believable to those inside the organization, be useful in day-to-day decision making, and have personal meaning for the staff" (Shaughnessy, 1999). Further the intent of using self-study techniques is to encourage the development of a professional learning community within the school and to make the work sustainable. Westheimer and Kahne (1993) state that schools need to have focused staff development on processes to build a professional learning community including: accessing relevant, quality literature, inquiry and self-study techniques, and the use of data.

A focus on including student voice is one of the most important dimensions of DIAD. Casey (1995) states, "The way in which children construct meaning in schools is [also] a relatively unexamined and potentially exciting avenue of inquiry" (p. 240). Further, "The voices of students are rarely heard in the debates about school failure and success, and the perspectives of students from disempowered and dominated communities are even more invisible" (Nieto, 1994, p. 396). Without adding student perspective we are left with only adult perspective that presents the child as a silent object.

The DIAD process requires a facilitator familiar with the process, planning time, recruitment of parents and community members, selection of students, and volunteers amongst the teachers to both observe and be observed. The planning session prior to the observation takes approximately two hours. Someone must also create a schedule for observations and gather

materials (i.e., notebooks, pens, chart paper, markers, and tape). A meeting room must be set aside for the observation day to provide the observation team with a place to meet and plan. Substitutes must be secured for those teachers who will be a part of the observation team. An after school meeting must be scheduled for the observation day to allow the team to share their findings. This is the suggested format from the SCC, but modifications can be made to meet the particular needs and limitations of the school.

Valley View, the Local Context

Valley View's first experience with DIAD occurred in January of 2000. Since the SCC was meeting in Phoenix and since many members, including myself, were new, the group wanted to find a local school willing to try DIAD. Since I was hosting the meeting through the Phoenix WestEd office, Valley View was my first choice for the DIAD event. I had worked at Valley View for two years as the teaching and learning facilitator, a position created by the principal, John Wann, who is a creative financier and a forward-minded thinker. Since parting from Valley View in 1998, I had kept in touch with the teachers and with John continually talking to him about the need to collect data on student learning. When the opportunity arose to involve this progressive and student-centered school with the SCC, I knew they were ready.

Valley View school is in Phoenix, Arizona, the sixth largest city in the United States with a population over 1.2 million, and one of the fastest growing metropolitan areas in the U.S. The community Valley View serves, is for the most part, an area of poverty where poor people, who are often Chicano, Mexican, or African American, reside. Valley View is a 700 student pre-kindergarten through 8th grade campus. The student population in the 1999-2000 school year was 80% Latino, 12% African American and 8% European American. Approximately 35% of the students enter the school with Spanish as their home language. Valley View has a dual language program that begins in kindergarten and extends through the eighth grade. The purpose of the Valley View Elementary School Dual Language Program is to develop bilingual, biliterate students who meet or exceed academic expectations in both languages by the end of the eighth grade. The bilingual immersion classrooms are comprised of English learners, Spanish learners, and bilingual students. The dual language program at Valley View is unique in that it is based on a neighborhood school design. Most dual language programs are found at magnet schools, importing Spanish learners from more affluent, Anglo neighborhoods. Valley View's program, however, is one in which the Spanish learners come from the community.

I first contacted John by phone to explain DIAD and the SCC. Having some interest in the process, John and I strategized about how to use DIAD. We talked about current initiatives at Valley View and decided to focus on their Peace Builders and Resolving Conflict Creatively program. Since this was a school-wide initiative it would be less threatening, less personal than beginning with teacher individual classroom practice.

The next week I came to an after school staff meeting and shared a brief written overview of DIAD adding some explanation and answering questions. During the next week Holly Harrison, a teacher and teacher mentor coordinator, asked each teacher individually about her interest in participating. The answer was overwhelmingly yes. There were a few dissenters and we invited them to be involved in the question formation if they liked.

On January 12th Joan Shaughnessy from NWREL came to help the school formulate the DIAD question and identify indicators. At an after school meeting, attended by most of the Valley View staff, the questions and indicators were identified. Schedules for observations and team assignments were completed for the next day's DIAD.

Holly Harrison describes the debriefing process the followed the DIAD observations:

> *After school, these observational teams collectively shared their experiences. Adults and students alike shared their observations to a group of over 30 staff members. Although I had expected to hear the normal shuffling of papers being graded and the not-so-quiet whispering, there was silence during the presentation. Again, the power of student voice was growing in both magnitude and message. Here were our students reflecting back to us the aspects of our community that we work so hard to nurture each day.*
>
> *After the specific observations came one of the most powerful moments of the day. Each adult observer went on to share a more personal reflection of what it felt like to be on our campus. To this day, two months later I have heard myself and others quoting these words: "your complexion (compared to other urban schools) is the same but your spirit is the difference." "Your students have a can-do attitude." "Your faculty and students seem very connected." In a world that bombards teachers with the negative and fails to mention the positive, these words were quite welcome. In many senses, their words inspired us and gave us the courage to start looking at our weakness.*

Because of the overwhelmingly positive response Valley View received, teachers were most excited about finding further uses for the process. Holly and I talked at length and we decided to use the DIAD process with an established group. We chose the dual language program teachers. This group had been used to using data as they, those present when I was there two years ago, had engaged in researching the impact of student enrollment in the program on their literacy development – both in English and Spanish

The question we studied was "what happens to the child who comes into the dual language program "late" (after first grade)?" We were concerned because late entry students are monolingual and are thrust into an environment where the long-term students are now bilingual, and secondly, have formed into a strong community – e.g., at third grade the group has been together for four years.

Eric Dueppen reflects on his involvement in the second DIAD experience.

> *As a third-year teacher and teacher-leader in the Valley View Dual Language Program, I have found myself experiencing the feeling of pressure and stress imposed upon me by my seemingly ever-increasing responsibilities. Early in the morning of our DIAD day, those pressures began to build in my mind as I reviewed the day's agenda. I felt torn between my desire as a leader to participate enthusiastically in something that I believed to be valuable, while at*

the same time resenting another day away from my students, away from the "job" that brought me to Valley View in the first place.

As I participated in the experience, I found my frustrations melting away as vivid connections were made between what I was seeing and the work that was taking place in my own classroom. The issue that we had decided to study was the impact of immersing recent arrival students in our program after first grade. What I was seeing was reinforcing for me the ideas of cross-age curricular units and planning as well as the potential effectiveness of early childhood strategies with older children.

In January, 2001, a third DIAD experience took place -- this time with the entire school. The focus was on writing. Central themes were: student engagement in the writing process, and the content and methodology of the writing curriculum. Six parents participated in observations, the most since Valley View began using DIAD. The process led to the decision to use protocols as a way to study the content of the writing curriculum. Further, the 7th and 8th grade team requested that the 5th and 6th grade team come into their math classes, observe them focusing on content and methodology, and give them feedback.

Critical Collegiality

Lord, (1994) describes critical collegiality as "confronting traditional practice – the teacher's own and that of his or her colleagues –with an eye toward wholesale revision" (p. 192). Further she identifies six elements of critical collegiality. The DIAD process fosters many of these elements within the school community. First, DIAD is an "organized and deliberate investigation" (p. 192) focused on creating, "self-reflection, collegial dialogue, and on-going critique" by teachers, students, staff, parents and community members. The process involves opening classroom doors to allow peers, students from other grades and classes, and parents and community members to critically examine school and classroom practice.

After observations, teams consisting of these various constituents analyze observations across teams and across classrooms. The analysis leads to summary statements which are shared back with the entire school community. This sharing leads to collegial dialogue and many times to on-going critique. Central to this engagement is the need to be open to new ideas the "willingness to reject weak practices or flimsy reasoning when faced with countervailing evidence and sound arguments" (p. 192). Through the dialogue teachers' practice and beliefs may be challenged both by observations and by student perceptions. It appears that allowing students to be part of the process encourages them to share their own school experiences that may go beyond the observation day. Further, by allowing students to take part in the process as an equal participant, they seem to become more willing to share feelings and experiences. One poignant example occurred during the second DIAD experience. A student, recently immigrated from Mexico, shared how she had never felt a part of the class, and how she felt reluctant to speak in class because she feared being teased by her peers.

Communication, another element Lord describes as important to critical collegiality, is also central to the DIAD process. School staff, students, and community members must find ways to talk to each other during analysis sessions, and struggle with how to present findings to the entire

school community that are honest yet tactful. The entire school community must find ways to discuss findings, searching for words that are understood across various groups. Another challenge that Valley View works through is that of presenting information both in Spanish and English so that all groups have the opportunity to understand and to be understood.

The DIAD process gains power when adapted by school communities. For example the 7th and 8th grade team requested the 5th and 6th grade team observe their math classes. This is an example of what Lord terms "collective generativity" (p. 193) where teachers knew how to use the process to continue with their own inquiry. Another example of teachers going beyond the process occurred during a recent election when a proposition to ban bilingual education was on the ballot. Holly Harrison began to talk to her 7th and 8th grade dual language students about how their lives would be impacted by this proposition. This small beginning led to an effort that went beyond Holly's class to include students from other grade levels in an organized campaign against the proposition. Students, with the assistance of the school technology coordinator, made a public service announcement, wrote to the local newspaper, contacted local television stations, and in an effort to get an audience with the governor, held a weekend vigil at the state capitol. These students were recognized at the National Association of Bilingual Education's annual conference in February of this year. In reflecting on these events, Holly identifies accessing student voice over this key issue as an outgrowth of the DIAD process. It is evident that the power of DIAD is not in the process itself but in the ideas key to the process: building a professional learning community and bringing student voice into school change efforts.

Lord's definition of critical collegiality focuses on "confronting traditional practice – the teacher's own and that of his or her colleagues" (p. 192) through the engagement of teachers in critical inquiry into their own practice. This sole focus on teachers may be somewhat limiting as suggested through the use of the DIAD process at Valley View School. To assess the impact of teaching we must turn to those we teach -- the children. To create disequilibrium student voice must be heard. It is unclear how, "Empathetic understanding (placing one-self in a colleague's shoes). [That is] understanding a colleague's dilemma in the terms in which he or she understands it" (p. 192) leads to critical examination of the impact of teaching on students. I would suggest that empathetic understanding of the student's learning and school experience is the key dilemma to understand. If not the focus becomes teaching rather than learning and may lead to an overemphasis on instructional techniques without an assessment of their effectiveness.

Learnings From the Valley View DIAD Experiences

Teacher Holly Harrison summarizes some key learnings from her experiences.

> 1)*Teachers gained confidence in their current practice, which gave them courage to identify specific things on which to work. Further, it encouraged them to ask questions, caused them to reflect about their practice more deeply and understand the value of reflection.*
> *2) Students reported, "for the first time I was a teacher of teachers." Further, students thinking about the school was broadened to whole school rather than limited to their classroom. Finally, students felt they were part of the solution, not only the problem.*

Principal John Wann describes his view of the impact of the DIAD process at Valley View.

> *As I observed the process at Valley View in the fall, I sensed the power and timeliness of DIAD's arrival to our campus. I wasn't able to participate in the Spring process until the end of the day sharing and yet, even within that hour's time, my feelings were confirmed. The voice of the students is tapped in ways that we have only struggled with in the past. Caring teachers often ask students what they would like to study, what they think, what they want to know, invite them to probe their own questions, etc. Yet this has been an illusive venture because at first one doesn't know. The DIAD frames a process that taps student voice in ways that have not happened before. The child' insight assumes a power through its authenticity that is perhaps even more significant that of the adult's. The potential to develop broader avenues for tapping these voices is the greatest I see through the DIAD.*
>
> *The parents' voices likewise were heard in new ways. In addition, this process not only captures the parent's voice; it also opens a huge window for the parent into the world of real teaching and learning issues. Especially significant is the practical nature of the process, data in a day! I believe it will be easy for us to develop a strong parent component to our on-going questioning.*
>
> *The teacher, of course, is left with insights presented in a caring way that cannot help but impact what she does tomorrow in addition to suggesting topics for more in- depth study and reflection.*

Teacher Eric Dueppen shares what he sees as the power of the DIAD process:

> *The positive impact of this self-evaluative experience will impact our daily practice as educators with the final result being what we are all working for anyway, that being the increased success of our children. This excitement has been shared by many of my colleagues, both those who were observers and those in whose classrooms we observed.*
>
> *There is power in the DIAD experience, not as a mere exercise but as a tool for shaping attitude and sharpening vision. I say this because I witnessed the power myself. Throughout the day, continued reflection and resultant planning conversations, my vision was refocused.*

This anecdotal data points to the impact that some Valley View teachers, students, and the principal felt from the DIAD process. Eric refers to the power of the experience as a way to shape attitude and sharpen vision. Holly writes that the process built confidence and fostered courage. John identifies how it opened a window for parents to understand teaching and learning. When we first experimented with the process at Valley View the depth of the benefits did not occur to me. Prior to this experience, I perceived DIAD as an event – a time when the normal day stopped, a possible opportunity for staging

interactions and associations. What Valley View did with this process is the real learning. It may be that conditions at Valley View led to making the process powerful for them, one that allowed access to multiple constituents and created space for honest dialogue with students.

In reflecting on the notion of critical collegiality it would seem that certain conditions must exist within the school to allow this to occur. For example, leadership that encourages, invites, and supports teacher inquiry, time for this inquiry and interaction to occur, a level of trust between colleagues, between administration and teachers, between parent and community members and the school, and most important a high level of student trust in their teachers. So maybe the question is how did these conditions come about? The selection of Valley View was intentional, they were, I believed, ready. How could you get a school ready for this experience? Could the DIAD process be used to build a professional learning community one that fosters critical collegiality? This is not a case study that can answer the question. What can be gleaned from this experience is how to build the process into the school. The importance of first using the process in a non-threatening way, to allow the school community to become familiar with it and overtime move into more contested and private areas. We can also learn how a school community can adapt the process to fit their own needs. And finally, we can see how a school community who embraces their students can deepen their commitment to them through giving them an opportunity to become part of the solution.

References

Casey, K. (1995). The new narrative research in education. Review of Research in Education, 21 (4), 211-254.

Lord,B. (1994). Teachers' professional development: Critical colleagueship and the role of professional communities. In N. Cobb (Ed.), The Future of education: Perspectives on National Standards in Education. (pp. 175-204). New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Nieto, S. (1994). Lessons from students on creating a chance to dream. Harvard Educational Review, 64 (4), 392-426.

Shaughnessy, J. (1999). General Information about Data in a Day. www.nwrel.org/scpd.natspect/diad/general.html.

Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (1993). Building school communities: An experience-based model. Phi Delta Kappan, 75 (4), 324-328.

Opportunities for Critical Collegiality Through Collaborative Action Research Teams[1]

Patricia A. Lauer, Ph.D.[2]

Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning

In 1997, Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) launched an initiative to create collaborative research partnerships with school districts in the seven states McREL serves. The purpose of these partnerships was to engage in collaborative action research projects that promote education reform (Lauer, Wilkerson, Goodwin, & Apthorp, in press). The projects' goals were (1) to build the capacity of district and school staff to use data and action research methods to identify areas in need of improvement and (2) to design and implement interventions to address those needs. The current paper describes how this initiative created opportunities for critical collegiality through the establishment of collaborative action research teams.

Professional Development through Collaborative Action Research

Collaborative action research is a process in which school staff, usually teachers and administrators, collaborate to conduct research that can facilitate education change and improvement. This process requires participants to share thoughts, reflect on their practices, and try out new ideas, all of which create opportunities for what Lord (1994) refers to as critical colleagueship. According to Lord, professional development for teachers is most likely to result in teacher learning when it creates critical collegiality through intellectual engagement. Wilson and Berne (1999) embraced this idea as well and emphasized the need for teachers to talk about subject matter and teaching in a community of learners who produce a collective wisdom. Lieberman and Grolnick (1996) described the related concept of teacher networks which are designed to produce collective wisdom by transforming teachers into colleagues who share concerns about teaching and learning.

Although many different events within and outside a school can bring teachers together (e.g., staff meetings, district inservices), according to Lord (1994), the following elements should be present for critical collegiality to occur:

1. Productive disequilibrium through self-reflection and dialogue;
2. Intellectual virtues and engagement such as openness to new ideas, willingness to reject arguments not based on sound evidence, the construction of arguments based on relevant information and best knowledge available, reliance on deliberate investigations as the basis of learning, and collective responsibility for a professional record of investigative activities;
3. Increased capacity for empathetic understanding of one's colleagues;

---

[1] Paper presented at the symposium "Critical Collegiality and Self-Renewing Schools," annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle WA, April 2000

[2] McREL, 2550 S. Parker Rd. #500, Aurora, CO 80014<plauer@mcrel.org>

4. Development of skills and attributes needed for negotiation, communication, and the resolution of competing interests;
5. Increased comfort with ambiguity and uncertainty;
6. Achievement of collective generativity or knowing how to continue. (pp. 192-193)

Table 1 indicates how collaborative action research activities connect with elements of critical collegiality. It is clear that collaborative action research can establish conditions for critical collegiality to develop and result in opportunities for teacher learning.

Table 1
The Connection Between Collaborative Action Research and Critical Collegiality

Steps of Collaborative Action Research*	Elements of Critical Collegiality
1. Problem formulation: the team of researchers reflects on and chooses a topic for research that they collectively find meaningful.	productive disequilibrium intellectual engagement
2. Plan for data collection: The team agrees on a triangulated plan to collect data on questions of mutual interest.	intellectual engagement empathetic understanding negotiation and communication skills
3. Collection of data: The team works at assembling a variety of pieces of data to answer the research questions.	intellectual engagement negotiation and communication skills
4. Analysis of data: The team looks for patterns of findings and draws conclusions from the assembled data.	intellectual engagement comfort with ambiguity
5. Reporting of results: The team prepares a report of the findings and understandings derived from the study and share it with colleagues.	intellectual engagement empathetic understanding negotiation and communication skills
6. Action planning: The team confers on the changes in the in the practice that might occur as a consequence of their analysis of the data.	productive disequilibrium intellectual engagement negotiation and communication skills comfort with ambiguity

* Taken from Sagor (2000, p. 183).

McREL Collaborative Research Initiative

For its collaborative research initiative, McREL selected seven districts representing various geographic locations (i.e., urban, suburban, and rural) and student populations (i.e., African American, American Indian, Anglo, and Hispanic). There was one district from each of the states in McREL's region. Table 2 lists the districts using assigned pseudonyms.

Table 1
McREL Research Partners

School District	Demographic Profile		
	Location	Income	Student Population
Adams	Urban	Low	African American
Jackson	Suburban	Low - Middle	Non-minority
Jefferson	Rural – frontier	Low - Middle	Non-minority
Madison	Rural – isolated	Low	Latino, Immigrant
Monroe	Rural – reservation	Low	Native American
Quincy	Urban	Low	African American
Washington	Suburban	Middle	Non-minority

In each district, a research design team was created consisting of McREL researchers, district staff (e.g., administrators, curriculum coordinators, school psychologists), principals, and teachers. Together, the design team selected a research problem, developed a research project, collected and analyzed data, and reported the results to district staff (Lauer et al, in press). The focus of each project varied according to local needs as well as McREL researchers' areas of expertise. McREL documented the activities of the design teams through case studies (Lauer, Apthorp, Vangsnes, Schieve, & Van Buhler, 1999) and evaluation reports (McREL, 1998; Wilkerson, 2000).

District Capacities for Collaborative Research

District capacities to conduct collaborative action research were critical to both the progress of the research projects as well to establishing a culture which would support critical collegiality. The design teams were often comprised of people who were not used to collaborating, such as teachers from different buildings, or teachers and administrators. With 24 members, the Madison design team was larger than other district teams and experienced difficulties with collaborating, as the following case study excerpt describes:

> While brainstorming research questions, it became apparent that district members held widely varying views of what the district needed to do next and what McREL should do with them, or whether anything should be done at all....Due to the frustration and mixed viewpoints that were being presented, McREL researchers suggested that some data collection should occur among Design Team members as a preliminary activity to designing a research question. (Lauer et al., 1999, p.36)

Sorenson (1998) noted that a collaborative structure cannot be imposed. Instead, participants must learn the skills of collaboration and teamwork. To this end, McREL devoted considerable time and energy during initial design team meetings to team-building activities, including conflict resolution training and building trust. Team work was critical to design team progress, as indicated by the following excerpt from the Monroe case study:

> An important element that emerged from the meeting was the value of the team-building activities. Although the local participants knew each other as employees of the same school district, they had not interacted as team members, nor had they interacted with the McREL participants. The team building thus established how the members would work together in designing and conducting the action research...Members were passionate in expressing the need for ground rules, and safety of expression was a particular concern. (Lauer et al., 1999; p. 47)

In their studies of schoolwide action research, Calhoun and Glickman (1993) found that teachers' and administrators' understanding of the research process is important for the success of research projects. For some design team members, data collection was synonymous with evaluation. McREL researchers provided teams with materials and training on action research, but progress by the teams depended on prior understanding and experience with data collection.

> For example, a low level of research and school improvement capacity among staff in Madison might have contributed to their inability to readily identify a research question. As a result, the concerns they initially expressed could not be easily categorized nor translated into questions for which data could be collected. On the other hand, in Jackson, staff members were more familiar with data collection, since they were in a state and district where stringent data collection procedures were already in place. As a result, it was far easier to generate enthusiasm for collecting data and using it to guide school improvement activities. (Lauer et al., in press).

Critical Collegiality and McREL Research Design Teams

As described earlier, Lord (1994) identified six factors that are important elements in critical collegiality. The design teams in McREL's collaborative research initiative experienced these elements to varying degrees, and their experiences changed over time as the research projects changed. The following section describes how critical collegiality occurred in the four McREL research partnerships that endured for at least two years.

Jackson. The Jackson design team was comprised of members of a committee that had been formed for the purpose of curriculum development. The participants already had established a working relationship which facilitated their *productive disequilibrium*. There was less need for team-building activities in Jackson. However, the design team members had not conducted action research previously, and they needed McREL's assistance with this process. The district's emphasis on data collection helped the Jackson team's early identification of a research problem, and the district's provision of time, money, and recognition facilitated the team's progress.

While conducting their first research study of how the district curriculum aligned with the state assessment, members exhibited *intellectual engagement* during the phases of problem identification, instrument development, and data analysis and interpretation. The team used its *collective wisdom* when they applied the results in designing additional studies, when they informally continued activities after the ending of the partnership with McREL. Through discussions about curriculum, instruction, and assessment between teachers and administrators on the design team, members' *empathetic understanding* was increased as were their *communication* skills. Effects of Jackson's research activities were documented as follows:

> The collaborative research conducted in Year One provided an opportunity for teachers to voice their professional opinions...Capacity building was evident in increased communication between district administration and teaching staff. (Lauer et al., 1999, p. 20).

Jefferson. The Jefferson design team was comprised of administrators and teachers from three different small towns, and this contributed to differences in school culture among the members. The McREL collaboration offered the district a unique opportunity for collaboration and communication. However, in contrast to the other districts, Jefferson participants pursued individual research projects instead of a collaborative one. The design team members met with each other to discuss the design and implementation of their projects, a process which led to *productive disequilibrium* and extensive *intellectual engagement*. Because their was no collaborative project, opportunities for empathetic understanding and collective generativity were minimal. However, teachers' *tolerance for ambiguity* increased due to their personal experiences with the research process. The following excerpt describes some of the effects on these teachers:

> Action research projects gave teachers opportunities to systematically define a problem, collect data to describe the problem and inform possible solutions, talk with colleagues about their practices, and collaborate with colleagues by sharing skills and resources (e.g., data organization and presentation). The Director of Instruction reported that Design Team members learned how to collect and analyze data as part of the action research experiences. Teachers provided leadership in their buildings by surveying practices, engaging teams in reflecting on graphed results, and leading building teams to design changes in practice. (Lauer, et al., 1999, p. 29)

Madison. The Madison design team was hampered by its large size and lack of collaborative experiences which reflected the general lack of collaboration in the district. One early design team activity brought district primary teachers and secondary teachers together for a potluck dinner. This created the opportunity for increased *empathetic understanding* among these teachers as did the many discussions at design team meetings that occurred among teachers from different grades and schools. As indicated in Lauer et al.(1999), the result was "the increase of positive interpersonal relationships among district teachers and administrators, particularly across buildings" (p. 39). To some extent, design team members demonstrated *intellectual engagement* through discussions of classroom practices and how to investigate them. However,

the disequilibrium that occurred was not productive and members' engagement in the research was not sufficient. At the beginning of the second year, Madison design team members began to express disillusionment with the research project and the findings and hence a lack of tolerance for ambiguity. The work of the Madison design team was hampered by competing interests between teachers and administrators, which led to the early ending of the research partnership with McREL.

Monroe. Monroe design team members devoted a significant amount of time to team building and ground rules. A particular issue to teachers was safety of expression in the presence of building and district administrators. Team members were *intellectually engaged* as they selected a research problem that would reflect the district's current needs. The decision to study classroom organization in the district's four schools led to *productive disequilibrium* and extensive personal reflection on classroom practices by the design team members who were teachers. The Madison team was very collaborative in the design and implementation of their research project and demonstrated *negotiation skills* throughout this process. They experienced significant *intellectual engagement* as they designed a survey instrument, collected the data, and interpreted the results, which McREL had analyzed. As the following case study excerpt suggests, the members were very involved:

> The Monroe design team members demonstrated a strong sense of ownership — and independence from McREL— during the research process. As the project progressed, district staff members began to recognize the importance of the data they were gathering. (Lauer et al., in press).

By the end of the research collaboration, Monroe design team members' *tolerance for ambiguity* had increased as indicated by their discussion of the survey results. While there was some indication of increased *empathetic understanding* from the examination of one another's classroom practices, design team members seemed more interested in the research and data than in each other. The design team exhibited *collective generativity* through their systematic research planning which became increasingly focused on issues related to student learning and through drafting recommendations for the district based on research results. Generativity and group wisdom were aided by strong support from the superintendent and from a principal who was the design team leader.

Learning through Collaborating

A study by Wilkerson (2000) provides evidence that teachers learned from their experiences as design team members. Wilkerson conducted an evaluation to determine the influence of the McREL research collaboration on individual and organizational capacities of the districts that participated. Surveys were mailed to 76 design team members, and 57 persons responded, of which 50% were teachers. Teachers indicated that their abilities to conduct research improved between "some" to "much" extent. Teachers' abilities to perform various roles also improved between "some" to "much" extent including the roles of reflective thinker, learner, critical thinker, and facilitator of change. Two-thirds of the teachers indicated "they were able to translate what they had learned from their participation on the design teams into their current practices. Most typically, they were able to apply their new teaming skills and strategies to their

work with students in the classroom as well as with colleagues in meetings" (p. 10). In interviews, a subsample of teachers commented that design team participation "provided opportunities to share information, exchange perspectives, and move forward in new directions" (pp. 12-13). Wilkerson's results suggest that by participating on the research design teams, teachers learned in ways that improved their individual capacities as teachers and researchers.

Other researchers have documented similar kinds of learning in research collaborations. Clark et al. (1996) discussed collaboration between K-12 educators and university researchers that resulted in mutual professional development. According to the authors, collaboration occurred "not in terms of *doing the same research work*, but rather, in terms of *understanding the work of one another* [italics in original]" (p. 196). For Clark et al., the central feature of this collaboration was dialogue among collaborators, which led to a better understanding of each other's practices.

The definition of collaboration given by John-Steiner, Webber, and Minnis (1998) is closer to what occurred in McREL's research partnerships. While the authors acknowledged the importance of respectful dialogue, they view collaborative research as involving shared views and work resulting in the creation of new knowledge. In their experiences with educator-researcher collaborations, the complementarity of participants' backgrounds and domains of expertise are powerful resources by which collaborators can combine independent thinking to create new conceptual frameworks. For example, McREL researchers and Monroe design team members combined their knowledge and expertise to produce a new understanding about classroom organization and instructional practices in the district.

Conclusions

Through the McREL research initiative, collaborative action research design teams provided a structure and process that resulted in elements of critical collegiality among participating teachers. As a result, teachers learned about conducting research and through their collaborative exchanges, experienced to varying degrees productive disequilibrium, intellectual engagement, empathetic understanding, improved negotiation and communication skills, and increased comfort with ambiguity.

The amount of critical collegiality that occurred among teachers in the different sites was related to several factors. One influence was the amount and type of personal experiences teachers had in the design and implementation of the research project. At sites such as Jefferson where teachers were responsible for their own research studies and at Monroe where teachers collaboratively designed an instrument and interpreted results, teachers demonstrated many elements of critical collegiality, particularly intellectual engagement. Another factor was the amount of trust that was established among team members. Madison had less experience with collaboration than the other sites and there was much distrust among teachers from different schools, which decreased the opportunities for critical collegiality. Support from administrators was a factor, which created positive conditions for critical collegiality. Jackson in particular received support from all levels of administration in the district, including the board of education, which helped the design team to flourish in their efforts. Thus, collaborative action research is an excellent process for fostering critical collegiality. However, for this process to result in learning, teachers need authentic hands-on experiences with the research, teamwork with a sense of trust, and support from district administrators.

References

Calhoun, E. F., & Glickman, C. D. (1993, April). *Issues and dilemmas of action research in the league of professional schools.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Clark, C., Moss, P. A., Goering, S., Herter, R. J., Lamar, B., Leonard, D., Robbins, S., Russell, M., Templin, M., & Wascha, K. (1996). Collaboration as dialogue: Teachers and researchers engaged in conversations and professional development. *American Educational Research Journal, 33* (1) , 193-231.

John-Steiner, V., Weber, J. R., & Minnis, M. (1998). The challenge of studying collaboration. *American Education Research Journal, 35*(4), 773–783.

Lauer, P.A., Wilkerson, S. B., Goodwin, B., & Apthorp, H.S. (in press). School districts and research organizations: Partners for school improvement. In S. Mitchell (Ed.) *Effective partnerships.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Lauer, P. A., Apthorp, H. A., Vangsnes, D. J., Schieve, D., & Van Buhler, R. J. (1999). *McREL collaborative research initiative interim progress report.* Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Lieberman, A, & Grolnick, M. (1996). Networks and reform in American education. *Teachers College Record*, 98, 7-45.

Lord, B. (1994). Teachers' professional development: Critical colleagueship and the role of professional communities. In N. Cobb (Ed.), *The future of education: Perspectives on national standards in education* (pp. 175-204). New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. (1998). FY 1998 partner survey results for research sites. Aurora, CO: Author (Evaluation Brief 99-2).

Sagor, R. (1997). Collaborative action research for educational change. In A. Hargreaves (Ed.), *Rethinking educational change with heart and mind* (pp. 169–191). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sagor, R. (2000). *Guiding school improvement with action research.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sorenson, D. (1998, November). *School-university partnerships: Collaboration among autonomous cultures.* Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, St. Louis, MO.

Wilkerson, S. B. (2000). *Enhancing district capacity to promote school reform through a collaborative research process.* Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. (Evaluation Brief 00-3).

Wilson, S. M., & Berne, J. (1999). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of research on contemporary professional development. In A. Iran-Nejad & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Review of research in education* (pp. 173-209). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

School Portfolios, Critical Collegiality, and Comprehensive School Reform

by

Dr. Edmund T. Hamann, The Education Alliance at Brown University

Brett Lane, The Education Alliance at Brown University

Susan Hackett Johnson, The Maine Department of Education

April 2001

(for presentation in Session 48:36 "Critical Collegiality and Self-Renewing Schools" at the American Educational Research Association's 2001 annual meeting in Seattle, WA)

Education Alliance at Brown U.
222 Richmond St., Suite 300
Providence, RI 02903-4226
(401) 274-9548
Ted_Hamann@brown.edu
Brett_Lane@brown.edu

Maine Department of Education
CSRD Program
23 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0023
(207) 287-2734

Abstract

Maine's deployment of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) program has been substantially different from that of other states. It has included the addition of several parameters and operating requirements that have made the CSRD-instigated school change process in that state particularly promising and worthy of study (Hamann *et al.* 2001). In addition to focusing its comparatively modest CSRD allocation all at the high school level and assuring even further overlap in each school's change process by tying funding to several practices recommended in the state's otherwise voluntary high school reform framework known as *Promising Futures* (Maine Commission on Secondary Education 1998), Maine's adaptation of the CSRD framework has also led, at state instigation, to 11 high schools' adoption of school portfolios. The portfolios, prepared annually, are used by schools to document and reflect upon the change processes they have formally embarked upon. The portfolios are externally reviewed, are formatively evaluated, and can become sources of "collective generativity" (Lord 1994:193)—i.e., sources of ideas that help school personnel know how to proceed.

It is in this last capacity that we see a tie-in between the practice of school portfolio drafting and the incubation of 'critical collegiality'.[1] As with others in this panel, we see critical collegiality as a needed condition for the intra-staff communication and coordination that enables schools to cultivate an ongoing capacity to self-critique and self-improve, particularly in the contemporary high-standards-emphasizing environment. Based on our familiarity with all 11 of Maine's CSRD high schools and from our further inquiry at seven of those schools, we found that school portfolios can be a mechanism for promoting the elements of Lord's (1994) model of critical colleagueship.[2] Put briefly, critical collegiality refers to school professionals' use of observation, formative feedback, and adjusted practice as a mechanism of self-critique and improvement. Though external advice should feature significantly in this type of a system, peer-to-peer professional commentary is a defining feature. Even though portfolios are internally produced by several professionals at a school, insertion of a portfolio requirement does not assure an outcome of critical collegiality. Indeed, the 'top-down' mandate to produce school portfolios, if not co-opted at the school level into a tool of self-monitoring and analysis, into an internally-controlled tool of professional development, can be a source of problematic 'contrived teacher collaboration' rather than the constructive 'voluntary' type (Hargreaves 1991). The key variable here is not the origin of the portfolio policy, but rather whether it is or is not 'owned' at the school level.[3] Of course, buy-in to the concept of portfolio creation does not necessarily mean buy in to each of the change steps that the portfolio process is supposed to document. Portfolios may occasion critically collegial conversation without always supporting each of the changes urged by federal CSRD requirements and Maine's *Promising Futures* framework.

If, at the 11 schools, contributing to either critical collegiality or contrived (and minimal) teacher collaboration was the most common (and dramatically simplified) outcome of the introduction of the school portfolio requirement, there was a third scenario. We did find in one instance that a school had taken ownership of the portfolio process, but that the portfolio still had a negligible effect on promoting collegiality. That school had in play enough other professional development mechanisms to promote collegial introspection and consensual decision-making that the portfolio's contribution to that end was viewed there as redundant.

I. Methodology

To prepare this paper, we distributed a survey with nine open-ended questions to each of the 11 CSRD schools and received responses from seven.[4] The questions variously asked schools to describe their first-year experience with the portfolio creation process, including noting who was and was not involved, and to clarify whether the dominant perception among those involved in its assembly was that portfolios were a task to be complied with versus an opportunity to reflect and learn. We then asked more directly about possible links between portfolio preparation and the stimulation and guidance of habits of coordinated reflection and planning. The full questionnaire is included in the Appendix.

If that was the most overt part of our methodology, this paper is, nonetheless, as much informed by our additional professional experiences with Maine high schools, with CSRD, and with portfolios. Johnson, with either Hamann or Lane, visited each school for one day 'Mid-course Reviews' during March 2001 as this paper was being drafted. Hamann and Lane have both been studying Maine's CSRD implementation for the last eighteen months, in the process producing Maine's federally required Year One CSRD state-level evaluation (Lane and Hamann 2000) and a technical report entitled *CSRD Roll-out in Maine: Lessons from a Statewide Case Study* (Hamann *et al.* 2001). For six of the Year One portfolio presentations, either Hamann or Lane was one of three assembled formative evaluators. Johnson was a formative evaluator for all 11. In addition to this year's site visits, Hamann and Lane visited 8 of the 11 Maine CSRD high schools during 1999-2000. Thus, we have spent 3 or 4 days at some of the CSRD schools. Hamann has also visited six Maine high schools that lack CSRD funding. This paper's third author, Susan Hackett Johnson, knows each of the CSRD schools even better and, through the process of coordinating a second round of CSRD applications, has also come to know well several non-CSRD Maine high schools.

As the Maine Department of Education's (MEDOE's) first and current CSRD Coordinator, Johnson has helped draft the original CSRD request-for-proposals sent to schools, has overseen each of the 11 CSRD schools' CSRD implementation, and has visited all of the schools more than once. Most importantly for this study, she was the originator of the school portfolio requirement. She has also reviewed each school's Year One portfolio and has provided each school with technical assistance in support of their portfolio completion process. Finally, she is the creator of the "Continuum of Evidence" (See Appendix) that clarifies the structure for each portfolio and clarifies the standards in reference to which the portfolios will be appraised.

Because all three of us have been involved in several capacities with Maine's CSRD schools, we are each positioned to see and explain how the school portfolios have fit within the much broader and multi-faceted CSRD implementation effort. This brings us to an important caveat. School portfolios are part of a process that includes Rider A's, Mid-course Reviews, portfolio presentations, and other modes of communication between the state and schools. (We clarify what Rider A's and Mid-course Reviews are in the next section). The school portfolios, in this context, are part of an overall CSRD school reform process. Many instances of critical collegiality are triggered by external events that indirectly relate to the school portfolio. Similarly, impediments to the creation of critical collegiality may not be directly related to the portfolios. In other words, the effectiveness of the portfolios for generating critical collegiality

has been inseparably intertwined with how other portions of the CSRD implementation effort have proceeded at a given school. Winnowing apart the contributions of one or another of these ingredients seems artificial, they are collectively and complementarily operative. This paper considers the viability of portfolios as a tool to promote critical collegiality, but we acknowledge that this proposition cannot always be directly and cleanly considered because of the concurrent play of related factors.

Finally, though not an ethnography (because it is not trying to define ways, orientations, and processes of a distinct group), this paper is nonetheless informed by ethnographic methodology. Returning to Hargreaves' (1991) distinction between 'contrived' and 'voluntary' collegiality, this paper is concerned with 'ways of seeing' (Wolcott 1999). That is, it wonders how those charged with completing the portfolio see that task. Is the portfolio viewed as a burden to be complied with or as opportunity for documentation, organization, reflection, and learning? As a complementary theoretical lens, this paper tends to the emerging methodological rubric of 'ethnography of educational policy' (Sutton and Levinson 2001), which focuses on how policies are created, understood, transmitted, and resisted, adapted, and co-opted. As with an ethnography (Wilcox 1982), we used multiple methods of data collection and analysis, including applied ones.

II. Portfolios as Professional Development

In September 1999, to meet the MEDOE's 'Rider A' reporting requirements for documenting the objectives and consequences of any expenditure greater than $25,000, the CSRD coordinator (i.e., Johnson) determined that each CSRD school would produce a school portfolio that would describe the CSRD-supported change process they had embarked upon and the learning and consequences that resulted.[5] Having decided this, Johnson subsequently found Victoria Bernhardt's (1994) *The School Portfolio: A Comprehensive Framework for School Improvement* and used that as a guide. At the end of each school year, each CSRD school would share its portfolio with the CSRD coordinator and would make a formal presentation of it to her and to other state officials and educators that she had recruited. Though portfolio review was intended to largely be a formative rather than summative task, failure to prepare and present a portfolio would be grounds for a school to lose continued CSRD funding.[6]

To support schools that were unsure of the new portfolio task, Johnson developed the "Continuum of Evidence" which offered straightforward guidelines and benchmarks to schools around which they could coordinate their implementation and their portfolio drafting. The "Continuum of Evidence" listed eight portfolio elements with a total of 56 benchmarks, or indicators, to be counted. (Each portfolio element had from three to eleven indicators.)[7] Though some indicators directly considered student achievement, consistent with Lord's (1994:188) critique of traditional staff development's prioritization of "instrumental significance," most indicators did not consider achievement directly (i.e., they were concerned with proof of substantive restructuring, including that which might not have immediate effect on achievement).[8] The 'Continuum' made explicit both what kind of information needed to be gathered for the portfolio and how it was to be arranged. Schools could also see clearly the criteria or expectations within each category. So, during the course of the year, in both the

implementation of CSRD and the assemblage of the portfolio, schools were in a position to appraise their efforts in relation to the indicators.

The development of the school portfolio as a means of meeting the state's contractual requirement (i.e., the Rider A Contract), but also as a mechanism for enhancing and supporting school reflection (i.e., critical collegiality), can be seen as an illustration of how state departments of education can move toward a more supportive role, rather than a monitoring one, in working with schools and districts (Lusi 1997). Twelve of the indicators from five of the eight portfolio elements can be readily tied to characteristics of Lord's model of 'critical collegiality'.[9] In other words, the practices, habits, and protocols that the portfolio is supposed to document may push faculty to interact in a 'critically collegial' way, *and* the assemblage of the portfolio may also produce the same result. (This second prospect will be discussed later.) Two of the twelve indicators pertain most directly, but the link between critical collegiality and three other indicators is also worth detailing.[10] Portfolio element #4 is meant to assess/document professional development practices. Indicators 4B and 4E ('4' refers to element #4) read:

- (4B) The school-wide system of professional development provides resources tailored to the individual goals and career needs of each employee which include support teams, peer observation and consultation, and access to learning beyond the school and the school day.
- (4E) There is evidence that the opportunities for professional development are varied and include knowledge and skill acquisition, modeling, practice, reflection, coaching, networking, and follow-up.

As with Lord's model, both of these indicators presume the implementation and valuing of an iterative process of practice, feedback, reflection, and adjustment. Both also presume a professional role for peers as well as externally-sited experts.

Indicator 4C queries whether a school's CSRD implementation demonstrates that time devoted to professional learning and growth are integral, not just in the abstract, but as a portion of each staff member's "work day, week, and year." Indicator 4D queries whether professional development at a school is consciously scaffolded to build knowledge and skills over time, instead of a more haphazard 'model' that has professional development consist of lots of one-shot non-integrated efforts. Both of these are requisite conditions for critical collegiality. Lord (1994:193-194) laments and criticizes how, "Time for reflection is limited by the many demands of teachers' time, and teachers often respond to new classroom challenges or demands by turning to the most reliable routines." That is, routines that recreate the problematic *status quo*. Sufficiently pursued, the practices and conditions described by these indicators will not reproduce the *status quo*.

Indicator 2G—Portfolio Element #2 inquires whether schools have organized students and teachers into teams and made the appropriate time, space, service, and facilities adjustments to support teaming—asks if teacher teams have the flexibility to shape schedules, facilities, and other resources to meet student learning goals. While Lord's critical collegiality does not *per se* insist on teacher teams or these categories for flexibility, it, like indicator 2G, does assume that professionals engaged in critical reflection and growth with their peers will have the flexibility to

adjust practices which their colleagues find ineffective or otherwise of concern. Absent a structure and culture that permit self-guided change, accurate peer diagnosis of difficulties and challenges would be a source of unending frustration rather than improved practice. Fully implemented teaming lends itself to peers' diagnosis of each others' difficulties, but the other conditions of flexibility/responsibility need to obtain for that peer insight to matter.

While a list of 56 benchmarks to develop evidence for is a tall order, it has helped assure that the very portfolio preparation process would require collegial interaction and collaboration. What constituted evidence? When was evidence too scarce? Too redundant or voluminous? Who knew best whether different promised processes were occurring? What was the evidence showing? How could it be synthesized for a portfolio narrative? What points would be highlighted at a portfolio presentation? Each of these was a key questions that required reflection, analysis, and communication. Moreover, though the indicators were externally set, portfolios gave educators at least some of the discretion recommended by Lord regarding the substance of professional development.[11] The substance of the portfolios was for site-based educators to decide, likely in consultation with external coaches and/or with Johnson.

III. The local context for using portfolios

When Maine schools first encountered CSRD, the mixing of state and federal priorities was already in place, as the state had already determined that it would concentrate its comparatively small CSRD allocation all at the high school level. It had further determined that applying high schools would need to indicate how their proposed reforms encompassed the goals and practices of the state's otherwise voluntary new high school reform plan known as *Promising Futures*. Three elements that were not anticipated at the time of the initial distribution of Maine's CSRD 'Request for Proposals'—Rider A contracts, school portfolios, and personalized leadership from the SEA—however, substantially shaped the actual roll-out of the program and have given it much of its promise. Significantly, the strategy and mechanics of CSRD implementation seem to have so far side-stepped the hazard of overt school-site resistance to 'top-down' management, and site-based educators appear to be willingly and deeply engaged in substantive attempts at school reform. That does not mean, however, an equal embrace for either all of the promised or all of the needed steps of reform. Indeed, some steps, like the portfolio sometimes, are only complied with, rather than subscribed to. This is not overt resistance, but nor is it the substantive engagement that effective professional development activities require.

In April of 1999, after the list of CSRD awards had been publicized, Maine's CSRD coordinator naively attempted to alert MEDOE's division of finance that the CSRD schools were ready to receive their first year allocation. 'Naive' reflects her characterization of that incident. To Johnson's surprise, the staff of the division of finance explained that they could not simply write a check for each school and pop it in the mail. For any financial disbursement of greater than $25,000, MEDOE requires the completion of a detailed contract, also known as a 'Rider A,' between the recipient and MEDOE. To a much greater extent than asked for in MEDOE's request-for-proposals to CSRD applicant schools, the Rider A contracts require schools to specifically demarcate and document the 'deliverables' that their expenditure will create. Moreover, to receive CSRD funding in Year Two and Year Three, schools need to re-draft and

re-submit adjusted 'Rider A' contracts for re-approval, re-approval that also depends on success at honoring the first contract.

In May of 1999, the CSRD coordinator was in the awkward position of needing to tell the newly designated CSRD schools that they could not yet receive their money because they had not passed a state requirement—i.e., the Rider A—of which they, until that moment, were unaware. Furthermore, Johnson also had to tell them that 'Rider A' contracts require more substantive and short-term proof of implementation and its consequences than had the schools' CSRD applications. Schools would need to revisit their applications and then be much more detailed in their promised 'deliverables' and promised methods of documentation and measurement of CSRD implementation than they had initially anticipated. They would need to complete a Rider A contract and agree to a mechanism for verifying their compliance with the contract. During the summer of 1999, Johnson worked with all of the schools on their contracts.

From a different vantage point, however, the 'Rider A' requirement meant that each CSRD-grantee school had to review, very early in Year One, their proposal and had to make tangible and acceptable their promises regarding what they thought they could accomplish. To a degree not required in the original proposals and at a time immediately prior to the start of implementation, schools were asked to clarify their goals, benchmarks, and measurement strategies. CSRD became a primary focus at a time when being a primary focus would most ensure its broad incorporation into schools' planning and practice. Thus, the moment 'Rider A' contracts were brought to schools' attention became a moment ripe with possibility, as long as a vehicle for documentation and measurement could be created and as long as schools did not retreat into sudden skepticism or resistance to what their foray into CSRD was now requiring.

The way Maine's CSRD coordinator solved the 'Rider A' dilemma was highly successful as measured by schools' continued willingness to try to enact CSRD and was the source of two additional factors that contributed to the creation of the CSRD schools as a tightly-knit and optimistic cohort—school portfolios and personalized implementation. After offering a *mea culpa* regarding the 'Rider A' contracts, in her early interaction with CSRD schools the coordinator simultaneously indicated both a seriousness of purpose and a receptivity to suggestions regarding how to solve the 'Rider A' dilemma. 'Rider A' contracts were not an obstacle that could be sidestepped or resisted, but how to meet the 'Rider A' requirement for careful documentation was an open topic for discussion and shared problem solving.

In September 1999, with each school aware that the dilemma of documenting 'Rider A' compliance needed to be solved and after each school had been solicited for input, the CSRD coordinator determined that each CSRD school would produce a school portfolio that would describe the change process they embarked upon and the learning and consequences that resulted. Though continued CSRD funding was contingent on successful completion of the portfolio task, the portfolio review process was explicitly much more akin to formative evaluation than summative.

MEDOE's strategic adaptation of a federal policy initiative, including the portfolio requirement, added much clarity to the school-to-school coherence of CSRD implementation, as

well as clarity to the within-school implementation task, but it also risked making CSRD seem very 'top-down' in a state where such management was acutely resisted (Ruff 2000). The mediation of the Maine CSRD coordinator proved integral to side-stepping potential resistance. She was able to deconstruct much of the authoritarian feel that is customary of a mandate by being candid and collaborative in her attempt to outline the unanticipated obstacles and in her attempt to resolve them. Johnson helped create a micro-political ecology at each school that got past sensing the Rider A, the portfolio, and other CSRD-related practices as tedious or suspect compliance activities.

The CSRD coordinator overcame this skepticism by building her personal credibility at each school and simultaneously reducing skepticism about state and federal requirements, particularly those requirements that schools had not volunteered to comply with when they first drafted their applications (i.e., the Rider A and portfolio requirements which were not known at the time of initial application). Epitomizing the personalized nature of her interaction with each school, she proclaimed at the end of a day-and-a-half CSRD school-training workshop in May 2000: "You all have my phone number." They did and they were accustomed to calling her or e-mailing her for guidance. As leaders of the CSRD implementation team at one of the high schools we visited said of her, "She's been a key person. We'll call her and talk for an hour."

Assisting her credibility-building task was the match between her previous experience as high school teacher and the fact that the whole Maine CSRD cohort consisted of high schools. Moreover, with the entirety of her teaching experience being at a school where several *Promising Futures* Core Practices were enacted (i.e., she had experience with interdisciplinary teaming, heterogeneous grouping, student portfolios, aligning performance-based assessment with standards, and so on), she had a credible and specific knowledge base that schools could tap.

At the heart of Maine's dubiousness to 'top-down' initiatives is a skepticism about formal authority (i.e., authority based on 'rank' rather demonstrated competence). In contrast, functional authority is not regarded with similar suspicion. The CSRD coordinator's functional authority was substantial, and for topics in which she lacked functional authority she opted for a collaborative leadership style ('let's figure this out together') rather than a hierarchical one.

We mention all this because functional authority seems to be a key ingredient of Lord's framework for critical collegiality. For the subject of a critique not to react defensively and/or angrily to critical feedback, requires the feedback receiver to trust the intention and expertise of the feedback giver. If Mid-course site visits and other vehicles of steady and candid communication were the means for credible state-level guidance of each school's CSRD implementation, then portfolios (among other vehicles) were in several instances the means for successful and credible intra-school communication, as will be further illustrated.

IV. Identifying the presence of 'critical collegiality'

Lord (1994:192-193) asserts that all critical colleagueship has six common elements. Each of those elements is considered one at a time in this section. They appear here in the order they appear in his text. In each case, there is evidence from at least one of Maine's CSRD schools

that the portfolio implementation task has assisted with the realization of Lord's element. However, none of the elements have been realized at all of the CSRD schools. Nor has any one of the eleven schools achieved all six of the elements (at least not fully), though two schools come close. Because these two schools come close and because several of the remaining nine seem to have met with some success on some of these elements, we maintain our original proposition that portfolios can promote critical collegiality. However, we hasten to add our caveat that they only seem to do so if the portfolio generation process is 'owned' by school site educators rather than just 'complied with' by them. For the portfolio creation process to yield critical collegiality it must be a collaborative, thoughtful, broadly involving proposition. That only sometimes has happened in Maine. If/when time constraints, micropolitics, and/or hierarchical school structures interfere with these conditions, then the promise of portfolios cannot be fully realized.

1. Productive disequilibrium

Sarason (1990) notes that successful school reform requires disenchantment with processes and outcomes as they are. Only from such disenchantment can come the courage to seek something better but unknown, in lieu of the comfortable familiar. In a similar light, Lord asserts that effective professional development requires a productive disequilibrium; that is, it requires a sense that 'things just are not quite right', combined with a belief that they can be made so (or at least that progress can be made). Indeed, in Lord's perspective for critical collegiality to continue to obtain, the view among participating educators must persist that their practice can still be improved. They must persist in believing that their craft is not yet as good as it could be.

Because of the caveat offered in the methodology section (of the simultaneous play of several CSRD related factors), we do not know if the CSRD Portfolios actually created productive disequilibrium, though we know they occasioned much collegial dialogue and reflection. The CSRD process collectively (including Mid-course Reviews) produced or channeled productive disequilibrium (though not necessarily for all staff) at some schools. By one read, the very fact that the schools sought CSRD funding suggests disenchantment with how things were and a willingness and promise to act very differently. However, having visited all 11 CSRD high schools in Maine, this read is a misleadingly generous description of at least many educators at CSRD schools. Read another way, many educators think their school could be made better and are willing to sign on to a plan that brings their school more resources; but this is not tantamount to serious questioning of current practices and structures. These educators are ready for 'reform by addition' (Sizer 1983), but not for the restructuring that Lord thinks is necessary to enable all students to achieve to high standards. Perhaps the distinction between the two 'reads' being suggested here can best be characterized as the difference between a willingness to 'tweak and supplement' versus a willingness to 'take apart, question, scrutinize, discontinue, and rebuild'.

Based on the seven returned surveys about portfolios, in many cases the portfolios occasioned reflection by school leadership teams. (All CSRD schools were encouraged to create broadly representative leadership teams who were to oversee grant implementation; actual broadness varied. In many instances the grant development team became the grant implementation team.) In two cases (of 7), portfolios were the context for reflection among the

entire school faculty. For example, one school devoted an end of the year professional development day to the entire staff's perusal and analysis of the portfolio, using it as a springboard for a 'what did we accomplish, what must we do' professional conversation. Four schools included in their portfolios lists/summaries of 'successes and barriers' that were developed for the Mid-course Review (n=4 of 7). Such lists represent a form of on-going critique and reflection at the school level. (See Lord's sixth element, collective generativity.)

2. Embracing Fundamental Intellectual Virtues

For this element, Lord includes educators' receptivity to new ideas, their willingness to recognize and reject weak practices and flimsy arguments, and their acceptance of responsibility to acquire and use information relevant for their arguments. We can reference this item by departing from Lord's broad reference point of collegial interaction, to the more discrete consideration of the task of portfolio completion. School personnel were open to this new task (at least at a compliance level) and, because of it, they did acquire information for purposes of supporting various contentions about change at their school. This process of marshalling evidence to argue a point is a substantial accomplishment if/when such a process can be attached to changes in other school-site habits, because it suggests the deployment of an important intellectual habit. It says much less, however, if its impetus was only to avoid trouble on the Rider A.

The CSRD process is itself a collection of new ideas about school reform and professional development. The school portfolio is the mechanism used by schools to collect and document their journey down the path of school reform. However, it is hard and perhaps unimportant to separate how documentation required for the portfolio drives reform processes versus how extant reform processes generate evidence that can be included in a portfolio. The school portfolio documents the consideration of new ideas and changes in school structure and practice and it embodies the habit of marshalling evidence to support a point. Lord's idea that professional development activities should create a collective responsibility for tracking teacher practice is evident in the school's use and creation of the school portfolio. In every responding school (i.e., all seven), there was a team of educators who were collectively responsible for creating the portfolio. They essentially created a professional record of teacher (and school) practice and innovation that would meet the requirements of the state to document a school's progress.

In three schools, the collective responsibility for creating the school portfolio went beyond the school leadership team and fell upon the shoulders of the everyday teaching staff. In one school, a separate committee was formed to manage and collect information from teachers for the portfolio. In another school, the school staff were not only aware of the 'CSRD Portfolio', but each staff member was asked to contribute a piece to the portfolio. While many teachers undoubtedly resisted this new responsibility, they were at the very least aware of the portfolio and the prospect of 'owning' the portfolio process was plausible. One could propose that the portfolio generation served to support the creation of a 'normative culture of responsibility' (Elmore 2000) and increased communication among staff. At one school the portfolio was the centerpiece for an extended 'state of the school' reflection among all staff at the end of the school year; at least there, 'critical collegiality' seems to have been enabled by the portfolio process.

The responses to our portfolio survey questions also show that in a number of schools there is still a division between what is considered 'changeable' and what is 'off limits'. Though he was discussing labor union issues, Paul Durrenberger's (2000) observation is salient here: "The way people think about things is rooted in their daily experience. If what you teach people is in agreement with their daily reality, then education appears to work. However, no matter what you tell people, if it is counter to daily experience, it does not have much impact and will not make a difference." Portfolios forefronted some proposed changes that, though not in place yet, seemed sensible and easy to accommodate. These changes were pursued. Portfolios also included content that pointed to uncomfortable potential changes. When that happened, data were ignored and/or contortions were made to sidestep its implications. This hardly amounts to critical collegiality. To illustrate, one can trace by its absence in the portfolios how student tracking is untouchable, even when there is substantial evidence of how with tracking common teacher planning time becomes an exhausting logistic feat.

In almost every school surveyed and visited, there is a portion of the school that is not active in the implementation of CSRD, nor in the use and creation of the school portfolio. It is not clear whether these uninvolved educators will find salient an argument made through the use of a portfolio. Unless the school portfolio is shared with the entire school, it seems clear that the portfolio will not serve as a mechanism for widespread critical collegiality, though the prospect remains that 'critical collegiality' might describe the habits, orientations, and modes of interaction of a sub-unit of a school's staff (e.g., the school's CSRD leadership team).

In the many schools where the portfolio is still a task rather than a broadly subscribed to habit, the portfolio will likely exist for a few years and be embraced by a few teachers, and then disappear when those teachers leave or the school moves in a different direction. Those individuals who participate in the creation of their school portfolio will engage in critical collegiality, but the longevity of that proposition is uncertain, while the likelihood of the persistence of using a portfolio is even more uncertain.

Survey responses were nearly uniform (one exception) regarding the precious value of chances to reflect. Tying this to the similarly widespread belief that the portfolios helped organize planning, documentation, and next steps, an argument that the portfolio has helped schools deliberate regarding strong and weak practices (rejecting the weak ones) seems viable. It also seems clear, however, that at some CSRD schools, time constraints led to strategizing about how to most efficiently comply with the portfolio requirement, instead of a conversation about the new habits of mind and interaction among educators that the portfolio task could promote. One survey respondent was emphatic that her school actively limited the prospective role of most of the faculty in the portfolio process because more input meant delay in the portfolio's completion. In contrast, another respondent said her school intended to involve more staff in the preparation of the Year Two portfolio.

3. Empathetic understanding

This is perhaps the hardest element on Lord's list to try to attach to the portfolio process, as there is nothing intrinsic to even a deeply engaged portfolio production process that directly compels the question, 'what if I were in your shoes?'. Nonetheless, we did collect some

evidence that the portfolio process had yielded instances of heightened empathy. According to one survey respondent, the school portfolio activity was viewed favorably as a means to better understand what the students were encountering when they had to complete portfolios. Another noted that the 'portfolio allowed us to model expectations we had of students'. (This is empathy with students, however, not among faculty.)

We suspect that there was an unrecognized empathy element at work among those respondents who credited the portfolio process with 'generating greater awareness of what co-workers are doing', promoting 'more collaboration in classroom and PD activities', and 'facilitating staff working together'. Perhaps empathy is also in play at the school that noted 'those involved with the [portfolio] review have developed into a team'.

4. Developing and honing negotiation, communication, and disagreement resolution skills

No doubt those who actually prepared the portfolios gained some negotiation, communication, and disagreement resolution skills, as the sheer task of portfolio creation and presentation required the collaborative labor of several individuals. But whether these gains by the preparers had or would have substantive broad impact on the school's ability to help all students achieve standards was more difficult to substantiate. As Muncey and McQuillan (1996) found in their long-term study of the Coalition of Essential Schools, the deep involvement of just a few in a reform effort (and clearly portfolio creation constituted deep involvement) can exacerbate existing faculty schisms and inhibit the long-term prospects of the reform's success. Plausibly, portfolio preparation (a proxy indicator of CSRD involvement) was a contributor to differentiation and conflict, though not necessarily its cause. (To be sure, we are being speculative here.) Clearly several Maine CSRD schools were struggling with disagreements about how to move CSRD forward, how to change classroom practices, and so on. The portfolios possible contribution to 'critical collegiality' and that collegiality's incubation of disagreement resolution skills was not yet in evidence at least at the divided schools, except perhaps in the negative.

On the other hand, evidence of improved goal-setting and increased collaboration (with alleged ties to the portfolio process) at several sites suggests that portfolios at some schools may be vehicles that enable negotiation, communication, and problem resolution. Particularly to the extent that the portfolios are assemblages of data that can support 'data driven change', the portfolios have a narrowing effect on the ways colleagues can disagree (because empirical evidence can be brought to bear when trying to understand/resolve a conflict). In other words, portfolios may well be tools that promote improved communication and negotiation in ways consistent with how 'critical collegiality' supports the same. To the extent the empathy noted in the previous element was a product of the portfolio process, then one could expect that empathetic understanding's contribution to communication and negotiation would also pertain as favorable evidence of a portfolio's contribution to critical collegiality.

5. Increasing teachers comfort with ambiguity and uncertainty

There may be indirect evidence of this dimension in comments like "[the] portfolio organized goals and direction of reform" and "reflection gave us confidence." However, this sounds a lot like the reduction of ambiguity is what is being praised, instead of comfort with it.

Though our survey did not have a direct prompt about this dimension, in our experience Maine's CSRD roll-out has pointed to a new but certain place. The 56 indicators in the "Continuum of Evidence" and the core practices recommended from *Promising Futures* are both clear regarding what processes should be engaged in. In other words, there has been very little in the use of the portfolios or, more holistically, in the Maine roll-out of CSRD that suggests that consistent ambiguity and uncertainty are viewed as valuable.[12]

6. Achieving 'collective generativity'

It appears that the portfolios have contributed greatly in this dimension, though they could contribute more. Most schools credited the portfolio generation process with helping to clarify/refine program goals and with helping to identify and eliminate weak practices. The logistic task of preparing the portfolio was credited with compelling organization and a related confidence about the state of the school change process. That said, the portfolios do not yet seem to have contributed to overcoming the problem that Sizer (1983) refers to as 'reform by addition'. In other words, schools all have claimed that the portfolio has helped them see more clearly how to go forward, but the schools are not showing evidence of integrating programs, eliminating redundancies, even of using the portfolios in lieu of other accountability mechanisms. Thus crediting the portfolios with helping educators know 'how to go on' needs to be asserted with a caveat.

V. What teachers learned

Equating time on task with learning is a flawed proposition. However, noting the hundreds of hours spent by teachers on portfolio reflection at Maine CSRD high schools seems important. Some teachers (though not all in most buildings) have worked hard on the portfolio task and, as a result, have gathered data, reflected upon them, tested proposed next steps in relation to the data, and generated lists of 'successes and failures'. The school portfolios have involved teachers in a tantalizing new way that promises more educator control over the reform process as a well as more deliberative approach to it.

However, much of the promise of the portfolios for forging critical collegiality seems not yet realized, as schools struggle with the complexity and immensity of the preparation task, as obstacles to reform that have been untouchable remain so, and as the intertwined and perennial issue of 'too little time' continues to be an excuse for not further engaging with portfolio creation and review. If the portfolios are to realize their promise to promote critical collegiality and the related processes of school-level self-scrutiny and improvement, three issues need attention.

- Many schools need help involving more educators and a broader cross-section of school staff in the portfolio development process. Those peripherally involved in the portfolio process cannot gain from it.
- Schools need assistance in eliminating factors that impede broader participation in the portfolio's creation. There needs to be strategizing about what existing professional development activities can be discontinued to avail school personnel the chance to participate with the portfolio. Schools could investigate ways to integrate the school portfolio into

existing professional development activities so that the portfolio becomes part of teachers' daily, or weekly, experience and is not seen as an 'add-on'. It seems probable that portfolios as archives of 'where we have been and who we propose to be' can substitute for (or be incorporated into) a host of previously pursued professional development and administrative tasks.

- With the requirement of completing portfolios to comply with Rider A requirements about to disappear—the 11 CSRD schools referenced here are soon to begin their third and final year of CSRD—an alternative rationale for preparing portfolios needs to be created, preferably an internal one at each school. The risk is that just as schools gain adeptness at portfolio creation they abandon the practice. Also a new, though perhaps similar, external portfolio review mechanism needs to be erected so that the critical feedback that is central to critical collegiality can remain a key ingredient of the portfolio process. Absent the review, portfolios would be more like data depositories without the promise of contributing to data analysis, reflection, and determination of 'how to go on'.

---

[1] This paper was initially prepared to be presented as part of a session entitled "Critical Collegiality and Self-Renewing Schools" at the American Educational Research Association's 2001 annual meeting in Seattle.

[2] Lord (1994) sees the enactment of 'critical collegiality' is a crucial mechanism for helping schools shift to have all their students achieve to high standards. In this sense, Lord echoes Elmore's (2000) concept of schools' 'internal normative culture of accountability'. Thus, though are analytic lens here is trained on Lord, we think portfolios could be a tool for achieving Elmore's condition as well.

[3] See Lord's (1994:198) first characteristic for the 'family resemblance across professional communities'.

[4] We are not well positioned to consider whether seven of eleven is a good or poor response rate. Schools received our questionnaire by e-mail from Johnson and were to return them to Hamann (also by e-mail) who they knew much less well. Schools were given little time to respond to our questionnaire, only two weeks, one of which was a vacation week. Five responses came on time, two arrived late but could still be included. It is unclear whether at the other four schools the request was ignored or whether the school missed the tight deadline and then decided it was too late to try to submit something (whatever their willingness otherwise). In all cases, one person filled out the questionnaire, though perhaps in consultation with someone else at the school. We can assure respondents' central involvement with CSRD and with the portfolios, but we have no direct way of knowing how representative their responses were of school-wide perspectives regarding the portfolios. We do know, however, that during the 2001 Mid-course Reviews, unlike those of the first year, portfolios were much less a topic of educator angst or, for that matter, of school-site educator comment. Apart from conversations regarding the logistics of portfolio presentation sites and times, portfolios were only rarely more than a peripheral topic of Mid-course Review conversations.

[5] As in most jurisdictions, CSRD schools in Maine have received $50,000 per year. Annual funding lasts for three years as long as school's expenditures are in accordance with promises specified in the annual Rider A contract submitted to the Maine Department of Education. As of the middle of the second year of the CSRD program no CSRD school in Maine had lost its funding.

[6] See Herman, *et al.* (1987) for detailed explanation of the differences between formative and summative evaluation.

[7] In crafting the list of portfolio elements and indicators, Johnson referenced the six Core Principles of *Promising Futures* and borrowed from a template prepared by state-level CSRD implementers in New York.

[8] Lord (1994) is not opposed to improvements in student achievement; however, he does criticize the tradition of staff development oriented towards modest fillips that temporarily nudge scores up but that have little long-term impact and that are not integrated with a long-term strategy of improvement. A mechanism that chronicles substantive restructuring (as Maine's CSRD portfolios proposed to), must capture evidence of changed processes, not just immediate, difficult-to-attribute fluctuations in outcomes.

[9] The six elements of critical colleagueship defined by Lord (1994:192-193) are described one by one in Section IV of this paper. As indicated earlier, in general they all refer to school professionals' use of observation, formative feedback, and adjusted practice as a mechanism of self-critique and improvement. Though external advice can feature significantly in this type of a system, peer-to-peer professional commentary is a defining feature.

[10] Coding the indicator first by portfolio element number and then the letter attached to each indicator in the "Continuum of Evidence" (See the Appendix), the following indicators can be attached to critical collegiality conditions: 2B, 2F, 2G, 2K, 3B, 4B, 4C, 4D, 4E, 5D, 7A, and 7E. For indicators 3B, 4B, 7A and 7E, the tie-in to Lord's (1994) 'critical collegiality' is peripheral or the link is plausible but not an automatic consequence of the indicator. In contrast, indicators 4B and 4E practically describe the practices necessary for critical collegiality.

[11] Though the 56 indicators were selected by Johnson (who, as noted, had consulted with state-level CSRD implementers in New York and had reviewed the Core Principles of *Promising Futures*), they were established in consultation with school personnel and in reference to a process—the enactment of CSRD—that 80% of the faculty in a vote accompanying the original application had acceded to. In other words, as we worry about educators' ownership or agency in relation to the portfolio completion process, it is worth remembering that they sought out CSRD, though not the specific school portfolio tool.

[12] This is not intended as a criticism of Maine's CSRD roll-out; rather it is only to acknowledge a point of discrepancy between that program and Lord's (1994) model.

References

Bernhardt, Victoria L.
1994 The School Portfolio: A Comprehensive Framework for School Improvement (2nd edition). Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Durrenberger, E. Paul
2000 Education Itself Does Not Solve Major Social Problems. Penn State News. (http://www.psu.edu/ur/2000/educationunion.html 2/6/01)

Elmore, Richard F.
2000 Building a New Structure for School Leadership. New York: The Albert Shanker Institute.

Hamann, Edmund T., Brett Lane, and Matthew Hudak
2001 CSRD Roll-out in Maine: Lessons From a Statewide Case Study (revised edition). Providence, RI: Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory at Brown University.

Hargreaves, Andy
1991 Contrived Collegiality: The Micropolitics of Teacher Collaboration. *In* The Politics of Life in Schools: Power, Conflicts, and Cooperation. Joseph Blase, ed. Pp. 46-72. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Herman, Joan L., Lynn Lyons Morris, and Carol Taylor Fitz-Gibbon
1987 Evaluator's Handbook. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Lane, Brett and Edmund T. Hamann
2000 Maine Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program: Year One Evaluation Report. Providence, RI: Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory at Brown University.

Lusi, Susan Follett
1997 The Role of State Departments of Education in Complex School Reform. New York: Teachers College Press.

Muncey, Donna E. and Patrick J. McQuillan
1996 Reform and Resistance in Schools and Classrooms: An Ethnographic View of the Coalition of Essential Schools. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Sarason, Seymour B.
1990 The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform: Can We Change Course Before It Is Too Late? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sizer, Theodore R.

1983 A Review and Comment on the National Reports. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Sutton, Margaret and Bradley A. Levinson
2001 Policy as Practice: Toward a Comparative Sociocultural Analysis of Educational Policy. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Press.

Wilcox, Kathleen
1982 Ethnography as a Methodology and Its Application to the Study of Schooling: A Review. *In* Doing the Ethnography of Schooling: Educational Anthropology in Action. George Spindler, ed. Pp. 456-488. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Wolcott, Harry
1999 Ethnography: A Way of Seeing. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Appendix

- Critical Collegiality Survey Questionnaire
- Continuum of Evidence

Survey Questions for Maine educators

Who are charged with maintaining their school's CSRD portfolios

BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTION: Please describe your personal role in the Year One and Year Two CSRD/Rider A school portfolio completion and review processes.

MAIN QUESTIONS:

(1) As a brief overview question (i.e., please answer in just two or three sentences), how has the completion and presentation of your CSRD-initiated school portfolio affected your school?

(2) Please describe the processes your school used to create your Year One school portfolio. How aware of the school portfolio requirement were most of the educational staff in your school? How involved were most of the staff in its creation and/or review?

(3) What have been the effects of the portfolio process on staff collaboration and/or collegiality?

(4) One of the 'buzz-phrases' of contemporary school reform is 'data-driven change'. Did creating or presenting your portfolio lead to any changes in your school's course of action for school reform (or did it reiterate the utility of any of the changes you have embarked upon)? Do you think those changes were 'data-driven'? (Please explain)

(5) Please describe whether, when, and how the Year One school portfolio generation and presentation processes compelled reflection about your school by staff at your school.

(6) How many staff and staff hours were needed to complete the portfolio during Year One? Have you found or do you expect that the Year Two portfolio to differ much from the first year's process (in terms of who does it or how long it takes)?

(7) What role(s), if any, did either Susan Johnson or your school's CSRD-required external coach play in helping you understand, complete, and/or gain meaning from the school portfolio task? Did anyone else not on your school staff assist you (if so please describe)?

(8) Was the "Continuum of Evidence" a useful guide that assisted your portfolio creation? Is there anything about the 'Continuum' that you would change? Were there any gaps or redundancies in it?

(9) Are there any other comments you would like to share regarding the portfolio process?

Portfolio Element #1

Effective Teaching and Learning Practices Core Practice #6 & #7

The school's implementation of its CSRD Program and Model is resulting in improved academic performance of students on the Maine Learning Results.

Indicators

By the End of Year One:

		No Evidence	Little Evid.	Some Evid.	Strong Evidence
A.	The school has developed and is employing personal learning plans that targets individual, as well as common learning goals, specifies learning activities that will lead to the attainment of those goals.				
B.	Student, teacher(s), and parent(s) collaborate in the plan's development execution, and review.				
C.	Student progress is reviewed regularly; past activities and assessments are used to revisit and, if appropriate, revise learning plans.				
D.	Parents and staff use the plan as a planning device for the transition from secondary school to a future appropriate for each student plans and assessments constitute a portfolio that exhibits, for future purposes, the student's talents, challenges and future potential.				
E.	The school is working to make learning standards, activities, and assessment procedures known to students and parents and assures the coherence among them.				
F.	The school has aligned the assessments it is using with the Maine Learning Results and with the CSRD Program and Model.				

Portfolio Element #1

Effective Teaching and Learning Practices Core Practices #6 & #7 (Continued)

By the End of Year One:

		No Evidence	Little Evid.	Some Evid.	Strong Evidence
G.	The school is using performance data to make decisions about the school's CSRD Program and Model.				
H.	The school has established benchmarks that express the adequate yearly academic progress they expect students to demonstrate and these benchmarks or expectations have been communicated to staff and parents.				
I.	The school demonstrates through local and/or state measures that students are making academic progress.				
J.	Students have, at all times, learning goals that focus and direct their activities; they pursue learning activities until their learning goals are attained.				
K.					

Notes:

Portfolio Element #2

Effective Organizational Practices Core Practices 9 and 10

The school has organized students and teachers on teams and learning governs the allocation of time, space, facilities, and services.

Indicators

By the End of Year One:

		No Evidence	Little Evid.	Some Evid.	Strong Evidence
A.	Students and teachers belong to teams that provide each student continuous personal and academic attention and a supportive environment for learning and growth.				
B.	The school schedule provides time regularly for the team's planning, assessment, and parent/student communication activities.				
C.	The team provides a significant portion of the student's academic learning experiences, the individual goal-setting, planning, and review activities of the personal learning plan, and a respectful "home base" where every student has an equal voice in team affairs.				
D.	Teams are not larger than 100 students and 6 faculty; they include a cross-section of students and remain together for the duration of the student's secondary educational career to the degree possible.				
E.	Parental participation in their students' learning occurs through the team structure and, within it, the personal learning plan process.				
F.	The school allocates each team sufficient space and equipment to facilitate its work and to give each student work space to support her/his continuous learning activities.				

Portfolio Element #2

Effective Organizational Practices Core Practices 9 and 10 (Continued)

Indicators

By the End of Year One:

		No Evidence	Little Evid.	Some Evid.	Strong Evidence
G.	Teacher teams, in concert with students and parents, have the flexibility to shape schedules, facilities, and other resources to meet student learning goals.				
H.	The timeframe in which learning occurs is unlimited; the length and form of a learning day, week, and year are shaped to meet student learning goals.				
I.	The "co-curriculum" is an essential part of the "curriculum;" students are expected to learn valuable skills and attitudes in each; and all curriculum is designed to address common and individual learning goals and standards.				
J.	Resources for learning are not limited to the school building and budget and include social services, universities, businesses, and public service agencies among others.				

Notes:

Portfolio Element #3
LEADERSHIP TEAM AND EXTERNAL SUPPORT

The school has a leadership team that guides the faculty in its work and makes appropriate use of high quality external technical assistance to implement its CSRD Program and Model.

Indicators

By the End of Year One:

		No Evidence	Little Evid.	Some Evid.	Strong Evidence
A.	Leadership team is made of representatives from school stakeholders, has an established decision-making protocol, communicates regularly to and from all constituencies and it's decisions are reflective of school community input.				
B.	The leadership team meets regularly to discuss and monitor CSRD activities. The team uses school data to inform its decisions and plan next steps.				
C.	The school has identified the areas where it will need technical assistance.				
D.	The school is aware of a variety of external technical assistance, beyond the Model developer, that is available and has begun utilizing technical assistance from multiple sources as needed.				
E.	The school has identified other assistance that it needs in order to successfully implement its CSRD Program and Model.				
F.	The school is aware of and is requesting, as appropriate, assistance from the District office.				

Notes:

48

49

Portfolio Element #4
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

In implementing the CSRD Program and the CSRD Model, the school is providing appropriate high quality, continuous professional development and training to administrators, faculty, staff and parents designed to increase the school's capacity for continuous, comprehensive improvement of student achievement.

Indicators

By the End of Year One:

		No Evidence	Little Evid.	Some Evid.	Strong Evidence
A.	The school has a detailed, articulated professional development plan that includes sufficient resources to support the CSRD Program and the goals set by the school for improvement of student performance.				
B.	The school-wide system of professional development provides resources tailored to the individual goals and career needs of each employee which include support teams, peer observation and consultation, and access to learning beyond the school and the school day.				
C.	Time devoted to professional learning and growth are considered an integral part of the staff member's work day, week, and year.				
D.	Professional development is scaffolded to build knowledge and skills over time rather than isolated, one shot trainings.				
E.	There is evidence that the opportunities for professional development are varied and include knowledge and skill acquisition, modeling, practice, reflection, coaching, networking, and follow-up.				

Portfolio Element #4
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (Continued)

Indicators

By the End of Year One:

		No Evidence	Little Evid.	Some Evid.	Strong Evidence
F	Parents and representatives from community-based organizations are involved in CSRD professional development activities as appropriate.				
G	Core administrators and faculty have received in-depth training in the CSRD Model. All administrators and faculty have received a comprehensive orientation and are able to articulate how the CSRD Model complements the school's CSRD Program and Goals.				

Notes:

52

53

Portfolio Element #5
STAFF SUPPORT AND PARTICIPATION

The school administration, faculty, and staff are knowledgeable about, and supportive of, the CSRD Program and Model and are actively engaged in implementation.

Indicators

By the End of Year One:

		No Evidence	Little Evid.	Some Evid.	Strong Evidence
A.	The school principal and other key administrators are conversant in, and supportive of, the CSRD Program and Model and play active leadership roles in implementation.				
B.	The majority of faculty and staff are supportive of the CSRD Program and Model; have received an orientation and initial training and are actively involved in implementation.				
C.	Implementation of the CSRD Model in the school is proceeding appropriately and is not jeopardizing the fidelity or integrity of the model's framework.				
D.	There is a process in place for administrators and faculty to collectively address barriers to CSRD Program and Model implementation.				
E.	Key District Office personnel (superintendent, asst. supt., curriculum coordinators, etc) have been oriented to the school's CSRD Plan and Model.				
F.	The Superintendent has taken steps to address issues/problems that are related to the support and implementation of CSRD at the district and school level.				

Notes:

Portfolio Element #6

PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

The school provides opportunities for meaningful parent and community involvement in the CSRD Program.

Indicators

By the End of Year One:

		No Evidence	Little Evid.	Some Evid.	Strong Evidence
A.	There is a building level decision-making committee (may already exist) that includes parents in discussions, plans, and implementation of school improvement initiatives.				
B.	Parents and community members have received an orientation on the school's CSRD Program and Model and receive periodic information on the progress of the CSRD Program and Model.				
C.	Parents and community members are actively engaged in meaningful roles related to the implementation of the CSRD Program and Model.				
D.	Community-based organizations working with the school have received an orientation on the school's CSRD Program and Model and receive periodic information on the progress of the CSRD Program and Model.				
E.	The School Board has been briefed about the school's CSRD Plan and Model and has received a general orientation. The School Board receives periodic progress reports on CSRD.				

Notes:

56

57

Portfolio Element #7

EVALUATION

The school has prepared and is conducting an evaluation of the implementation and impact of the CSRD Program and Model.

Indicators

By the End of Year One:

		No Evidence	Little Evid.	Some Evid.	Strong Evidence
A.	The school has identified or developed, and implemented instruments, monitoring and feedback procedures and information systems that will provide information about CSRD implementation.				
B.	The school is collecting and analyzing school level data that will provide information, along with state and district assessments, about the impact of the CSRD Program and Model on student academic performance.				
C.	There is evidence that school administrators, faculty, parents and other key stakeholders have examined evaluation information (implementation and impact) that could result in modifications or changes in the CSRD Program or Model.				
D.	The school is disaggregating, analyzing, and interpreting student data by factors such as grade level, race, gender, poverty, dominant language, migrant status, and handicapping condition.				
E.	The school has created a school portfolio for self-assessment and uses it to organize its school-wide reform efforts. Teachers and other members of the school community are aware of the portfolio and the process for updating and adding information.				
F.	The school evaluation of its CSRD activities has had an impact on the school's plan for activities in the second year.				

Notes:

Portfolio Element #8

ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES

The school identified the resources (personnel, materials/equipment, service, funds, etc.) that it needs to implement the CSRD Program and Model and has begun the process of realigning resources to sustain the CSRD Program after funding ends.

Indicators

By the End of Year One:

		No Evidence	Little Evid.	Some Evid.	Strong Evidence
A.	The school has included a budget summary that clearly documents expenditures and they are related to CSRD activities.				
B.	The school has done an analysis of the budget summary from Year One on what resources are needed to implement the CSRD Program and Model and has proposed a budget summary for Year Two based on this information.				
C.	The school has analyzed its existing resources (local/state/federal funds, personnel, equipment/materials, etc.) and is in the process of realigning those resources to sustain the CSRD Program and Model.				

Notes:

60

61

Portfolio Review Summary Feedback

Indicators

By the End of Year One:

		No Evidence	Little Evid.	Some Evid.	Strong Evidence
A.	The school is meeting the terms and conditions of the CSRD grant.				

Summary Feedback by Reviewers:

62

63

A Study of Critical Collegiality in one of The Learning Network® Schools

Helen S. Apthorp, Senior Researcher, McREL,
Vicki Weseman, Principal, and Peggy Moses, Teacher Leader,
Prairie Park Elementary School and
Marilyn Herzog, Coordinator, The Learning Network®

With a standards-driven approach to curriculum, instruction, and assessment, professional development must help teachers acquire (or deepen) subject matter knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge (Lord, 1994). To achieve these aims, it has been suggested that professional development move beyond the traditional training paradigm and become a community and process called "critical colleagueship" (Lord, 1994). The key features of critical colleagueship or collegiality are (1) structures and resources that support teachers in their efforts to expose their classroom practices to other teachers and educators, (2) access to resource-rich professional communities that engage teachers in learning, and (3) members who actively contribute to meaningful, critical understanding of subject matter, teaching and learning.

This report presents an examination of how The Learning Network® (TLN) might have allowed a school to create some of the key features of critical collegiality and help teachers deepen their subject matter and pedagogical knowledge in the area of language arts. The report is based on data collected for a study conducted in February, 2000 on implementation of comprehensive school reform (CSR) models differing in orientation toward literacy. Prairie Park Elementary School working with TLN with support from the CSRD program was one of nine schools selected for that study (Snow-Renner and Apthorp, 2000). Data were collected through teacher surveys, classroom observations, observations of professional development activities, document review, and administrator and other instructional leader interviews. At the time, Prairie Park Elementary School was in its 2nd year of work with TLN.

The Learning Network

The Learning Network® (TLN) is an organization of schools designed to help schools change the way teaching and learning is understood and supported. The Learning Network is a process by which administrators become active and involved instructional leaders and teachers develop deep understanding of theory that drives good classroom practice. At the core of TLN is the teaching and learning cycle, a theory of teaching and learning that presents teaching and learning as a cyclical activity with four elements: assessment, evaluation, planning, and teaching. Although the Literacy Learning model has its roots in the theory and practice of literacy education in New Zealand, the model is applicable to any teaching and learning situation from a teacher working with kindergarten students, to a middle school social studies teacher, to a coordinator of staff development or administrator working with a group of teachers. The model is based on the assumption that for new learning to occur, the teacher must know what the learner needs (involving assessment and evaluation) and how to teach it (involving planning and teaching).

Schools working with TLN have access to various professional development activities, including, a summer institute on Literacy Learning in the Classroom, The Learning Network Annual Conference, The Leadership Seminar, a two-day inservice on Creating the Instructional Resource Room, other inservice opportunities, a national listserve, a local series of TLN Focus Meetings of teacher leaders, a professional educator (TLN Coordinator) who visits and consults with school personnel regularly, a host of professional books and handbooks, and forms that guide educators through a process of learning what constitutes good practice.

Schools working with TLN adopt three new organizational structures and practices that, in particular, appear to allow creation of some of the key features of critical collegiality: a *Critical Triangle* of professionals, *Instructional Dialogue*, and *Policy Statements*.

- *Critical Triangle*: comprised of a key school administrator (usually the principal), two teacher leaders chosen from the faculty, and TLN Coordinator.
- *Instructional Dialogue*: a professional conversation in which a teacher, using the reflective process supported by action plans, instructional dialogue forms, and a written record of benchmarks and indicators of understandings, explores his or her understandings about teaching and learning.
- *Policy Statements*: Content-specific documents that connect collective beliefs of the staff to state and district requirements regarding children's development in reading, writing, spelling and handwriting. Policy statements become a vehicle for students to move seamlessly through school experiencing consistency, quality and continuity in the school's instructional program.

Prairie Park Elementary School

Prairie Park Elementary School is in Lawrence School District, Kansas, which has been nationally recognized for its exemplary professional development. Prairie Park's reform history is intimately linked to district initiatives. The Learning Network® was adopted by the district Board as a pilot approach to implementing the district's Reading Initiative. It was piloted in four schools including Prairie Park. District leadership viewed TLN favorably for its development of instructional leadership among principals.

Prairie Park Elementary is located at the edge of a subdivision of one-story houses. There are about 410 students enrolled in grades K-6; 25% of the students are eligible for free and reduced lunch. The school was built in 1993 with a Commons Area (cafeteria) at the core; the library, music and art rooms, gym, and main office as spokes to the Commons Area as the hub. Down the hall from the main office is a connecting hallway to all the classrooms.

The Prairie Park mission statement is, "We believe all students will learn to make responsible social and academic decisions through varied learning opportunities."

Evidence of Different Elements of Critical Collegiality

Productive disequilibrium and self-reflection. The Learning Network® weekly Action Plans provide teachers regular opportunity to describe what he or she currently knows, to question current thinking, and to plan his or her own growth. The Learning Network® Action Plan forms ask teachers a set of guiding questions, including, "What area do I need to explore," "What do I know," "What questions do I have," "What questions do I need to explore to develop my understanding," and "How will I develop these understandings, in my practice, in other ways?"

When an Action Plan is completed, new practices relevant to the plan are tried out and observed by a Teacher Leader or Learning Network Coordinator. The Teacher Leader or TLN Coordinator feeds back to the teacher what was observed, what students reported, and what students produced. In the *Instructional Dialogue* following the observation, the Teacher Leader or TLN Coordinator asks *why* a certain action in the classroom was performed, creating disequilibrium about one's practice and the focus for shared reflection, collegial dialogue, and critique.

An excerpt from an *Instructional Dialogue* between a first grade teacher and her Teacher Leader illustrates these elements of critical collegiality. This dialogue focuses on language arts content standards and productive dispositions (i.e., proofreading and being accountable for the effectiveness of one's own communication). The critique involves comments from the Teacher Leader that describe the teacher's actions in pedagogical terms drawn from professional books and theory. Finally, the Teacher Leader creates disequilibrium by challenging the teacher to focus on understanding principles, not just implementation of tools, and encouraging empathetic understanding by modeling inquiry about her student's perspectives.

1/25/00; 8:12 am (TL = teacher leader; T = teacher)

T "I won't be able to get the whole alphabet on there. I don't want to do it if it doesn't work. I need to get with Mary to see how she does it."
T (writes on Instructional Dialogue form): "talk with Mary and Peggy about writing alphabet on folder."
T "The use of the dictionary frustrated and distracted the students from trying to sound out."
TL "What support can we as teachers provide?"
T "Model writing and use of dictionary when done drafting to check it."

The TL then referred to a graphic model of the reading-writing process and the verbal labels for its components, and asked, "What construct are you applying?"

T "Holding kids accountable; use of modeling as a powerful teaching tool."
TL "How is that understanding going to impact your practice?"
T "Actually pulling out a dictionary and explaining how to use it. I did it earlier during drafting, and need to change to teach it during proofreading."

T (completing Action Plan): "I'm exploring how to make it work for all students."
TL "Specifically, you're focusing on proofreading."

T "The folder thing is bugging me."
TL "With an Action Plan we want to focus on understanding, not the tool."

T (continuing to complete Action Plan): "I know the importance of modeling and proofreading."
TL "I'm wondering about first graders. What does proofreading mean to first graders? What does it look like for first graders?"
T "How am I going to manage everyone, get around to everyone?"
TL "You're talking/thinking about assessment."
T (records on Action Plan): "How do I evaluate their understanding of proofreading and spelling?"
"I need to develop my understanding of kids' understanding of spelling and proofreading."
TL "Pages 60-61 gets into correcting and proofreading (referring to Dancing with the Pen); also about assessing groups. Page 64 talks about conferences."

T (shows a student's spelling from dictation): "I'm looking at journal writing for these 30 words."
TL "Why do think its so important at this level to get these core words?"
T "Writing for life."
TL "What understanding drives that practice?"
T no response
TL "It is that close approximation, in their zone of proximal development."
T "I've learned more this year than any other."

Intellectual virtues embraced. A willingness to reject a weak practice in light of evidence was suggested by the teacher's statements in the *Instructional Dialogue*. When speaking about her practice of modeling how to use the dictionary during drafting, in light of the evidence that her students were frustrated and distracted from getting their own words down on paper, the teacher revised her practice, stating: "I need to change to teach it during proofreading." She rejected a weak practice, that is, modeling use of the dictionary during drafting, in light of evidence, that is, her students were distracted from the focus of the lesson which was drafting ideas in writing on paper. The evidence she noted in her students' response was not the sole reason for rejecting her weak practice. Her understanding of language arts content standards, namely, aspects of the writing process, and her opportunity to describe her practice, reflect on it and critique it, together with classroom evidence, probably all contributed to her willingness to revise her practice.

Another intellectual virtue illustrated in this *Instructional Dialogue* was a willingness to seek the best knowledge from subject-matter communities. While not face-to-face

interactions, author-to-reader connections were made repeatedly with professional literature, namely, Dancing with the Pen, a book about language arts pedagogy published by the New Zealand Ministry of Education. Moreover, although reliance on organized, deliberate investigations was not evident, the TLN action plan and *Instructional Dialogue* encouraged weekly examination of evidence rather than learning by accident. Ongoing, self-directed learning guided by action plans and *Instructional Dialogue*, is a core process of The Learning Network approach to teacher and school development (Richard C. Owen Publishers, 1999).

Increased capacity for empathetic understanding. Everyone, including the principal, articulates, implements, and reflects upon weekly action plans and engages in *Instructional Dialogue*. By walking the talk, becoming learners themselves, the instructional leaders increase capacity for empathetic understanding. During this second year of work with TLN, the Prairie Park Teacher Leaders and principal were themselves learners participating in the Leadership Seminar, a series of TLN Focus Meetings, and *Instructional Dialogue* with the TLN Coordinator who observes them in other *Instructional Dialogues*. Moreover, the Teacher Leader's questions and think-alouds during the *Instructional Dialogue*, can help teachers take the perspective of their students as learners. For example, the Teacher Leader thought out loud in the dialogue provided above, "I'm wondering about first graders, what does proofreading mean to them." This led the teacher to articulate a learning goal for herself to "develop my understanding of kids' understanding of spelling and proofreading."

Increased teacher comfort with ambiguity. Increased conceptual understanding of language arts content and theories of teaching and learning has the potential to increase teacher comfort with ambiguity. The content of the *Instructional Dialogue* recorded above, including repeated references to professional books and a theoretical model of the reading-writing process and the teaching and learning cycle appeared to focus on developing teacher conceptual understanding. In the *Instructional Dialogue* the Teacher Leader reminded the teacher to focus on understanding, not the tool, and asked for a conceptualization and justification of her practice several times: "What support can we as teachers provide; What understanding drives that practice; What construct are you applying; Why do think it is so important?"

By guiding the teacher to think about teaching and learning at a more abstract level along the lines of general principles rather than focusing on concrete, discrete instructional actions and tools, the teacher may be more likely to handle the unpredictable circumstances natural to teaching. Teachers working with TLN may be developing crucial, generative knowledge for picking up on opportunities to advance student learning. As Lord (1994) explains, teaching involves complex relationships and enduring questions that require the exercise of sound professional judgment in unpredictable circumstances.

> "The circumstances in which professional knowledge becomes relevant are difficult to anticipate, but if teachers lack crucial knowledge they are likely to miss opportunities to advance student learning. This is precisely why teaching

demands professionals whose knowledge of subject matter, instruction, and student learning is both broad and deep" (Lord, 1994; p. 183).

One goal of TLN is to help teachers become more capable of making the professional decisions needed for good instruction (Richard Owen, personal communication, March 23, 2001). In addition to asking conceptual and higher-order questions, the Teacher Leader in the *Instructional Dialogue* above, frequently identified a practice as a member of a conceptual category; for example, "you're focusing on proofreading," "you're talking/thinking about assessment," and "It is that close approximation, in their zone of proximal development."

In addition to encouraging and guiding teachers to think in general principles, more conceptually, the TLN approach may encourage increased comfort with ambiguity in other ways. Increased comfort with ambiguity may be encouraged by (1) the development of trust between the Teacher Leader and the teacher, and (2) the confidence of the teacher that the relationship is not evaluative (Richard Owen, personal communication, March 23, 2001).

Skills associated with negotiation, improved communication and resolution of competing interests were honed. As the first author shadowed and interviewed the principal on site, data were collected informally about school culture and opportunity for communication and resolution of competing interests. The most obvious quality of the school culture was its academic focus supported by a safe environment. From the morning announcements, to classroom activities, to lunch time discussions, to the end of the day, there was a brisk, organized pace of practice and reflection on reading, writing, planning, and thinking by both students and staff. Students developed, followed and revised their own Daily Plans. Teachers and administrators alike developed, followed, and revised weekly Action Plans. Conferences about reading, writing and plans were held throughout the day between teachers and students and between the professional educators themselves. At the close of the day, no student was let out the door without a friend or sibling with whom to walk home.

The second most obvious quality of the school community was that it was in flux, in its second year of a comprehensive school reform program to be exact. The principal had provided a suggestion box for the school community inviting anonymous comments. During the first author's site visit, a comment was recently placed in the box about the *Critical Triangle* being more directive rather than open and willing to negotiate. The principal at the time noted in response to reading this comment that diverse perceptions existed among staff about the progress of the current reform aided by TLN. Resolution of competing perceptions or interests would be the focus of time spent in communication and negotiation beyond the time scheduled for the present data collection effort. Therefore, to what degree and in what manner skills were honed in this regard remains unknown.

The pressure to experiment and analyze the outcomes of the reform's investment was anther felt quality in this reforming school. The school was one of four sites given the

task of figuring out if The Learning Network (TLN) was worthy of district-wide adoption for implementing the district's Reading Initiative. Honing skills associated with negotiation, improved communication and resolution of competing interests across the district were evident in one bi-weekly focus meeting visited by the first author.

The bi-monthly focus meetings were attended to by the Teacher Leaders and principals from all four schools piloting TLN in the district. At this particular meeting, the principals together with the District Language Arts Coordinator drafted a letter to the Board to advocate a policy change in staff assignments that would support fuller implementation of TLN structures and practices of the *Critical Triangle*, *Instructional Dialogue* and *Policy Statements*. Skillful negotiation with district leadership and resolution of competing interests were evident in the letter's language.

Achieved collective generativity. "Knowing how to go" was evident in one of the structural changes recommended by The Learning Network's comprehensive school reform program, namely, *Policy Statements*. The Learning Network's end of the year review report (June 1999) for Prairie Park stated that "as part of the school continuous improvement process and the state accreditation process, the staff developed goals in the area of reading, writing, and problem solving. The staff began work on a policy statement in reading that integrates what is already in place and is in line with state and district goal statements in reading." These goals were collectively generated. If these goal statements are distributed widely and referred to regularly and collectively in staff meetings, they can serve as common knowledge about how to go on.

Secondly, "knowing how to go" appeared to be in an emergent form of knowledge among district instructional leaders at their bi-monthly focus meetings. Leadership skills and knowledge were demonstrated at these meetings. One participant, in particular, explained how to adjust use of running records to assess student comprehension by posing genre-specific questions aligned to state standards. The Teacher Leaders in attendance at the focus meeting examined a chart she shared with them which listed student names in rows and comprehension benchmarks in columns. In each cell she had recorded a rubric score (1 - 4) to reflect each student's skill level of performance. Her leadership potential for teaching others how to adopt standards-based approaches in Language Arts was evident.

This particular individual also demonstrated understanding of the reform's theoretical principles and the necessity of supportive policies to allow implementation to occur and be sustained; for example, she stated, "It's putting understandings into practice that's key and how to fit it all in with all the daily intrusions and interruptions: State Singers coming, the Guidance Counselor wanting to speak to the children, the DARE guy wanting to speak with the children, etc." She also identified the current challenge in the reform's implementation, focusing the group on a problem needing attention, stating, "There are teachers who still don't see that the tangled/struggling readers are their responsibility." Her leadership potential for directing resources and attention in ways that would move the reform forward was evident.

Was this really critical collegiality?

Were assumptions about teaching exposed? The assumption that teaching is the job of a technician delivering pre-constructed curriculum or activities was exposed. During an *Instructional Dialogue*, a Teacher Leader challenged a teacher to focus on understanding rather than just managing a tool (which in this case was a proofreading folder), encouraging the teacher to be more thoughtful and deliberate about practice decisions and designs for teaching rather than mindlessly accepting someone else's recommendations.

Did teachers get to understand the value of their own descriptions of teaching? Teacher leaders and teachers during the first two years of working with TLN voluntarily completed and carried out Action Plans weekly. The Action Plans engaged teachers in articulation and reflection about their practices in relation to their growing understanding of teaching and learning and content standards in Language Arts. Whether or not teachers got to understand the value of their articulation about their teaching is unclear from the data collected for this case report. The one *Instructional Dialogue* transcript analyzed for this report demonstrated that at least one teacher learned more this year than any other year. The conditions and experiences that may have motivated this comment, however, remain unclear.

Was there more intellectual rigor than might be expected from district-provided professional development? While data were not collected to compare the intellectual activities of the *Critical Triangle*, *Action Plans*, *Instructional Dialogue*, or *Policy Statements* with the intellectual activities of the district professional development, such an inquiry might be instructive. Another topic for future research on The Learning Network® is interaction with subject-specific professional associations. It was not clear from the data collected to what extent The Learning Network® encouraged educators to seek the best ideas from subject-specific professional associations such as the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and the International Reading Association (IRA).

Evidence was strong for several key features of critical collegiality at Prairie Park Elementary School in their work with The Learning Network®. Knowledge and learning were viewed as systematic, professional, and theoretical rather than accidental as evident in dialogues recorded from both the *Instructional Dialogue* and Focus Meeting. A focus on the content standards for language arts was evident across a number of TLN professional development activities, including, Action Plans, *Instructional Dialogue*, and Focus Meetings. Teachers, Teacher Leaders, and principals accessed resource-rich professional communities through reading professional material. Finally, teachers appeared to be acquiring crucial, generative knowledge for picking up on opportunities to advance student learning in Language Arts as evident in statements about content standards and principles of learning and teaching.

Skills associated with negotiation, improved communication and resolution of competing interests for discussing literacy teaching and learning were honed. The faculty collectively generated goal statements (i.e., *Policy Statements*) in reading, writing, and problem solving in line with state and district goals. Faculty also learned to constructively

engage in *Instructional Dialogue* which is a two-way conversational critique of and reflection upon one's practices and profession involving negotiation of meaning, perspective, and theory. Honing similar skills for discussing the process of whole-school change and reform, however, was not as evident. Opportunities existed for honing these skills, but the time of data collection did not allow investigation of this particular area of skill development.

What professional knowledge was acquired?

Educators at this site appeared to acquire two types of professional knowledge.

Conceptual knowledge about

- principles of teaching and learning as a cyclical activity (e.g., modeling as a powerful teaching tool; close approximation) and
- language arts content standards (e.g., proofreading as a way of holding young writers accountable for the effectiveness of their communication).

Procedural knowledge about how to

- set goals for one's own learning as a teacher,
- inquire about students' perspectives,
- think conceptually, not just practically in response to fragmented, day-to-day situations
- open up one's teaching for observation and critique, and
- seek out best ideas and knowledge from subject-matter communities.

In conclusion, this case report describes and analyzes evidence of critical collegiality at one elementary school where faculty and the principal were working together with The Learning Network® to improve teaching and learning. A transcript of one *Instructional Dialogue* was provided. The Teacher Leader-teacher discourse in the *Dialogue* was analyzed for evidence of intellectual virtues, increased teacher capacity for empathetic understanding, increased teacher comfort with ambiguity, and honing skills associated with negotiation, improved communication and resolution of competing interests. The analysis suggested evidence of intellectual virtues, including valuing conceptual, principled knowledge about learning and teaching, self-directed learning and opening up one's practice to critique, willingness to reject weak practices in light of evidence, and access to resource-rich professional literature. Comments on the analysis were also sought from The Learning Network® leadership. It was noted that developing trust and teacher confidence in the Teacher Leader-teacher relationship as not being evaluative may also contribute to teacher learning. How such trust and embracing of intellectual virtues develop more broadly across a school community is an issue for further research.

References

Lord, B. (1994). Teachers' professional development: Critical colleagueship and the role of professional communities. In N. Cobb (Ed.), The future of education: Perspectives on national standards in education (pp. 175-204). New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc. (1999). *Understanding the Learning Network.* Katonah, New York: Author.

Snow-Renner, R. and Apthorp, H. (2000). An exploratory study of CSRD-funded schools: Classroom practices in K-5 Literacy. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL).